

# Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

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

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV1	
Reference	EV1		Type	Change	Comment Late No

### Comment Changes

Advantage re developement of EV1 and assocaited infrastructure Centralised developement of village promoting walking and cycling to amenitys as opposed to peripheral expansion, necessitatiing car use and congestion therein.

### Representation

Site EV1 – Teandallon East - Capacity :125 The area indicated as 10.3 Ha could sustain a higher capacity and by allowing a more generous gain to a developer would provide a greater incentive. If the desired capacity is regarded as 210 in total this is achievable and attain a high level of convenience with safety allowing provision of the desireable improvements. A major benefit is also the proximity to the school and safe footpath access to the store. Traffic would be more widely dispersed saving tempers and possibly life.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV1	Teandallon East	
--------------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Customer Number	03971	Name	Thomas McIntyre	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV1	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late No

### Comment Changes

Objection to building development close to Tigh An Dallon House.

### Representation

Tigh An Dallon House is the only private residence located next to EV1 therefore: 1. Disruption to our daily lives. 2. Views blocked by building of prperty in front of house. 3. Access problems from Swordale Road. 4. Too many homes in location. I would like to know what steps are going to be taken to avoid these points.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV1	Teandallon East	
--------------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Customer Number	00419	Name	Mr Donald Lockhart	Organisation	Albyn Housing Society Ltd	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph			
Reference	EV1		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

The Plan should allow for modest development off Thomas McIver Street

Representation

A small development of amenity housing would be appropriate to complement the provision in the area

Allocated to	Evanton	EV1	Teandallon East	
--------------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

---

Customer Number	03971	Name	Thomas McIntyre	Organisation		
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV1 Teandallon		
Reference	Area of .23 acre in plan belongs to me.		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Notified Proposed Development Site is redrawn to omit .23 acre next to Tigh An Dallon House which is registered to me.

Representation

As per purchase document.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV1	Teandallon East	
--------------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation		
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	ev1		
Reference	ev1		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

noting that developement of EV1 should also lead to improvement of road infrastructure , linking Swordale to the main through road, reducing traffic flow through the centre of the village , with associated reduction of risk to pedestrians and cyclists

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV1	Teandallon East	
--------------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation		
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	ev2		
Reference	ev2		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Acknowledgement that due to limited demand, any further consideration of this site would reduce the economic viability of the developement of site EV1, which has already been purchased and in ownership of the Highland Council and previously considered for developement.

Representation

Due to above, any consideration of development of EV2 would negate any interest in development of EV1 resulting in loss of value and return from this publically held asset.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV2	Culcairn	
--------------	---------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	00419	Name	Mr Donald Lockhart	Organisation	Albyn Housing Society Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	EV2		Type	Support	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

#### Representation

This is a key site which provides a range of opportunities and encouragement should be given to bring it forward

Allocated to	Evanton	EV2	Culcairn	
--------------	---------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04018	Name	Alan Farmer	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV2 - Culcairn	
Reference	EV2 - 160 Homes, Business & Community		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

To remove EV2 - Culcairn development from the proposed local development plan.

#### Representation

1. The local Primary Achool is too small to accomodate an extra influx of students. 2. The topography would result in excess rainwater flooding off a new development onto the existing houses which already have a history of flooding. 3. It would spoil the view of Fyrish Hill and woodland for the existing residents surrounding the area. 4. There are alternative locations which are more central to the village and more suitable for development. 5. When Novar Estates got the area accepted into the local development plans there were irregularities in the methods used to achieve their goals. The main one was a failure to communicate with local residents as to their proposed plans. When questioned on this matter Novar Estates said they had mailed a letter to each house in the surrounding area which is NOT the case. I have spoken to a substantial number of local residents and have yet to find anyone who DID receive any communication. When a committee of local residents took the matter up with the local community council we discovered that they too had stated their objections and were overruled. 6. There are limited public transport facilities to the village with no rail link and a reduced bus service. This would probably result in an increasing number of cars in the village which has moderate parking facilities. In particular the primary school has very poor drop/pick up areas for parking, 7. The telephone exchange is outdated which results in slow broadband speeds - with extra housing this would place an increased burden on the exchange resulting in even slower speeds. 8. I feel there will be an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours by reason of noise, disturbance, loss of privacy, being overlooked etc. 9. The proposed development is overbearing and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. 10. The development would possibly compromise highway safety.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV2	Culcairn	
--------------	---------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reinstate " Significant structural planting will be required between the development and the existing housing and on the eastern boundary of site" - this has been " softened to "landscaping to the east boundary with Culcairn"

Representation

I do not have any other objections to the development if appropriately designed, mixed housing with sensitive commercial use if there is landscaping as per inquiry

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Specific information on Road Safety, particularly in relation to pedestrians and cyclists. More attention to preserving amenities for existing and new residents by extending significant planting. Detailed information on how this development will be sympathetic to Evanton's rural environment. Map to include accurate position of burn and the implications of future flood risk.

Representation

1. Road traffic through Evanton village is already perilous to pedestrians, particularly in Station Road; my observation is that primary school children from Novar and Fyrish Crescents rarely walk to school unaccompanied by an adult. The pavements are currently narrow and hazardous with little room for expansion, and although the document mentions paths for cyclists and pedestrians there was not enough detail. Can residents be confident that, given the increased level of traffic through the village at peak times, creating a safe route to local amenities, including the primary school, is possible? 2. I note that the 'Requirements' include 'significant planting on the eastern boundary', but the residents in Glenglass Road, and the dog walkers in the adjacent lane, who for many years have enjoyed the benefits of the 'distinctly rural environment', including outstanding views over cultivated farmland, bordered by native flora and fauna, have not been considered. Could additional sympathetic planting to preserve the amenity be included in the final plan? 3. The word 'sustainability' has rightly been referred to repeatedly in this document, and yet the development is on prime agricultural land which can never be replaced. 'Significant' planting, protection of indigenous lizards, possible cycle tracks and footpaths have been mentioned but can residents be reassured that the development plan will be detailed enough to provide more information on how it will be sympathetic to Evanton's unique rural environment? 4. I notice that the map shows a 'drain' to the north-west of EV2. Strangely the 'drain' seems to come to an abrupt end beside Culcairn Steading. This is actually a small burn that continues beyond Station Road. Extensive flooding occurred here some years ago, with Culcairn Cottage and houses and gardens in Glenglass Road being affected.

Allocated to

Customer Number	03978	Name	Stanley Munro	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	EV2		Type	Change	Comment Late

Comment Changes

Wish to see the proposal taken out of the Development Plan, as previously stated in letters of objection.

Representation

Comments and objectives previously made to you remain. I seriously wonder whether our objections have been taken on board by elected members and /or officials. We still consider the re-zoning of this agricultural land for housing & business use to be unnecessary. there is already and has been for many years, land ALREADY zoned for housing at Western Teandallon and it has NOT been used. There appear to be no signs of it being used for housing in the immediate or medium term, so we don't see it being fully utilised in the time scale of your proposed plan. We are also concerned to see changes to the number of proposed houses in the field have been moved upwards. Originally it was to be 195, which was then reduced to 85 and now you are proposing 160 houses. It looks as though the Council are just sticking to their own agenda: just going through the motions of the Consulation process. We remain totally opposed to the proposed development and yet again confirm our written objections to the entire development, as proposed for the Culcairn site EV2. Will you take note of our objections and views this time and respond to them?

Allocated to	Evanton	EV2	Culcairn	
--------------	---------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	ev2	
Reference	ev2		Type	Change	Comment Late

Comment Changes

Clarification of proposed number of dwellings , etc , noting 85 sites considered previously in local developement inquiry

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV2	Culcairn	
--------------	---------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV2	
Reference	ev2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Restoration of presumption in favor of agricultural use to be reinstated in keeping with general strategic plan. Current land use having historical extensive period of highly productive utilisation. note no previous consideration of land being put to set aside.

Representation

Site EV2 – Culcairn – 12.3 Ha - Capacity Previously reduced to 85 This can be reduced totally as not required nor desireable – At its extremity it is some 1800m from the School and would aggravate the congestion and dangers presently experienced.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV2	Culcairn	
--------------	---------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	03864	Name	Mr Allan Moore	Organisation	Allan Moore (Drummond) Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Andrew Bennie		Bidwells	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paragraphs 1.147 – 1.151	
Reference	Site Reference, EV3 Drummond Farm		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

“ The deletion of the requirement for the development of this site to be linked in terms of a joint master plan in relation to the development of Site Reference EV1 Teandallon East and the removal of any timing restriction on the delivery of this site linked to the provision of the new bridge crossing which is required in order to properly access the Teandallon East site.”

Representation

The changes to the Proposed Plan, which are sought under the terms of this representation, relate to separate albeit linked issues, these being the relationship that exists between the development of this site and the site at Teandallon East. These two sites are physically separated from each other by quite some distance, with the nature, form and scale of the development proposed for each being distinctly different. Whilst the scale of the development which is envisaged for the Teandallon East site, and the infrastructure upgrades that will be required as an integral part thereof, is such that it will require a properly constituted master plan to guide and inform its delivery, the same is not true of Site EV3, where the scale and extent of the proposed development is significantly smaller and of much less strategic importance. Of most significance is the fact that the successful delivery of Site EV3 is not dependent upon the construction of the new bridge crossing which is required to open up the Teandallon East site, and as such, it is considered to be wholly unreasonable and unjustifiable to seek to link the development of Site EV3 to the provision of this new bridge crossing. The area covered by Site EV3 is such that it will be able to physically accommodate all of the “requirements” that are noted in respect thereof. This having been said, that fact that the site can accommodate the same does not impart any responsibility on the part of the eventual developer thereof to provide any items of infrastructure which are not required as a direct consequence of the development of the site or to make any master planning provision for their implementation. The general rules governing the matters, which can be addressed via planning obligations are clear to the extent that all such obligations must be reasonably related in scale and kind to the nature of the development to which they relate. In this case, as the new bridge crossing is not required to allow for the delivery of Site EV3, this site should not be required to make any “contribution” towards its provision. This having been said, the sponsor of Site EV3 is prepared to assist in the preparation of a master plan relative to the Teandallon East site, by way of making land available to assist in the detailed design of the new bridge crossing and for the construction of the other community upgrades which the Council has indicated will require to be provided, some of which Site EV3 may reasonably be expected to contribute towards. This offer is made on the clear understanding that as the delivery of Site EV3 is not dependent upon any of the major road infrastructure upgrades that will be required in order to allow for the development of the Teandallon East site, that the development of the site can be taken forward on a “stand alone” basis and in advance of the delivery of the new bridge crossing. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Changes to the Proposed Plan, as set out above, should be accepted by the Council.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV3	Drummond Farm	
--------------	---------	-----	---------------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	ev3	
Reference	ev3		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

To acknowledge that there should be linkage re developement of school and facilities with this site use and that this should also be a pre requisite for the use of EV1

#### Representation

Site EV3 – Drummond Farm 5.4 Ha Provided they are prepared to extrapolate some of the area to accommodate the expansion of the school, associated parking, recreational area and suitable safe access then they could earn the right to the additional planning gain on the remainder of the development.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV3	Drummond Farm	
--------------	---------	-----	---------------	--

Customer Number	00881	Name	Miss Sheila Fletcher	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Evanton	
Reference	EV3		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

Change the proposal to allow the houses to be built on the higher area of the site and allow the amenity and expansion of school to take place in the lower area adjacent to Drummond Road

#### Representation

I have 3 reasons for this representation. 1. The current sewer serving houses on Drummond Road is behind the current houses on Drummond Road. It would be much easier for a sewer for the new housing to be taken from the top of the site in a line adjacent to the main road connecting with the existing main sewer at Drummond Arms. 2. Having houses adjacent to the main road will extend the 30mph limit out as far as the cross-roads at the road to the cemetery and Drummon Farm Road. This will be of great advantage in slowing cars down on the approach to the monument and river bridge where children walk to access school. 3. When we built our house on Drummond Road we had a planning restriction which allowed us to build a house of no more than 1.5 storeys. A recent 2 storey house has been allowed at Glenskiach and we are fearful that any new houses in the Drummond Farm field adjacent to Drummond Road could be allowed at the same height. The proposed development is on the uphill side of the existing houses and will block our outlook. Development on the higher part of the site will not affect our outlook

Allocated to	Evanton	EV3	Drummond Farm	
--------------	---------	-----	---------------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

For this land to remain undeveloped

Representation

We own a holiday chalet business directly across from the proposed development site. We have worked so hard to renovate our own dwelling, and also spent years growing trees on one side of our land to enclose the chalets, protecting them from the road noise of the Evanton to Alness road. My husband and I both intend to retire soon, to concentrate on cultivating our existing holiday chalet business. If this development goes ahead our plans and our business will be severely negatively affected. We will have no rural outlook at all. At the moment we have lovely views of the Firth over to the Black Isle. We already have some noise from the Skiach services and the industrial units nearby, I fear the lack of view and added noise will severely compromise our retiral plans, as we will not be able to attract tourists. Our property and land will be devalued.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Split 7th bullet point into two separate bullet points – •Demonstration of account being taken of the Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation Management Scheme  
•Compliance with JNCC piling guidance

Representation

The 7th bullet point for Evantion EV5 includes two factors which we consider would be clearer if they were separate bullet points (as has been done for Invergordon IG11 and IG12), so we would like to see 'Compliance with JNCC piling guidance' as a separate bullet point.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04364	Name	Katharine Rist	Organisation	Woodland Trust
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	EV5		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

### Comment Changes

Trees on banks of Allt Graad are AW, protection already required. Suitable setback also required.

### Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV5	Highland Deephaven	
--------------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number	00204	Name	Mr Andrew Brown	Organisation	Scottish Natural Heritage
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	Evanton EV5 Highland Deephaven		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

### Comment Changes

Amend text in 6th bullet point from Special Protection Area to Special Area of Conservation

### Representation

The 6th bullet point under developer requirements refers to ‘Moray Firth Special Protection Area’. This should read Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation because it goes on to refer to disturbance effects of increased marine traffic in combination with other proposals, with reference to the ‘Dolphins and Development’ model. Bottlenose dolphins are a qualifying interest of the Moray Firth SAC. This is as per the Draft HRA Record.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV5	Highland Deephaven	
--------------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

EV5 encircles 14 private houses. There needs to be more of a 'buffer' area between any development and the houses to maintain the amenity of the existing properties.

Representation

EV5 encircles 14 private houses. At present there is no mains sewerage, low water pressure, no mains gas, poor road provision. I do not see how there can be further development down here without significant investment in infrastructure. I would also question how close to the houses the developers will be allowed to operate, whether there will be provision for there to be no activity close to the house outside of normal office hours, both in the initial development phase and for any industry that then operates out of the development, and what likelihood there is that there will be provision for upgrading the infrastructure to the benefit of the householders at time of any industrial development. The amenity of these 14 households must be maintained during any planning consultations.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Acknowledgement that rail linkage directly to the deephaven site , is currently unfeasible and alternative use as a drop off station is inappropriate for the community.

Representation

Site EV5 – Highland Deephaven – 147 Ha The jetty extension may or may never transpire but the rail link has become an impossibility due to insurmountable technical problems and other site changes which now preclude access and link up. The permissions have already expired and a totally fresh approach and application would be required.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04146	Name	Ulrich Herbst	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Site EV5 Highland Deephaven	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Site area reduction in the in the Inner Morray Firth Ports and Sites 2005 it states that the development site is 176ha in the recent developoement plan it states as 147.1 ha

Representation

It already states in the Inner Morray Firth Ports and Sites 2005 that the Deephaven development has limited competitive advantage and that therefore it reduced the project fundabililty as well as that the planning permission 02/009003/FULRC has lapsed Also that the cost in 2005 was estimated at £6m is it still an option you consider with the area reduction as well?

Allocated to	Evanton	EV5	Highland Deephaven	
--------------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number	00881	Name	Miss Sheila Fletcher	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV5	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Reduce area to preserve the woodland and marshy area adjacent to the River Skiach.

Representation

The proposed area includes very valuable habitat. The small lochan is not included in the proposed development area but there is an adjoining area of scrubland and trees that forms part of the natural habitat and a nesting area for a number of birds. A kingfisher has been seen here and disturbance of the area would lead to the loss of valuable species.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV5	Highland Deephaven	
--------------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number	03122	Name	Mr Howard Brindley	Organisation	Brindley Consulting
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.22	
Reference	Strategic Employment Sites		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

In the Strategic Employment Sites section I would like to see a full reference to the other major industrial sites in the Ross-shire Growth Area in particular Highland Deephaven, currently at page 141 EV 5.

Representation

The proposed local development plan on page 57 refers to the Ross-shire growth area and the plan's support for the growth of employment generating uses at sites along the Cromarty Firth. This section of the plan then focuses on three sites at Fearn, Fendom and Nigg. It makes only passing reference to the other strategic employment sites in the growth area, for example Cromarty Firth Industrial Park and Delny, and in particular Highland Deephaven. The details of these sites are to be found later in the proposed plan in the general allocations for settlements. In the case of Highland Deephaven's this is to be found in a "Local Centre" This is not good presentationally, particularly as the Local Development Plan will become a key document in promoting the Inner Moray Firth area, and will be used by investors to identify major industrial opportunities.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV5	Highland Deephaven	
--------------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number	04364	Name	Katharine Rist	Organisation	Woodland Trust
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	EV6		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Bounded on NE and NW edges by AW. Setback from trees to be assessed in this context.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to	Evanton	EV6	Evanton Industrial Estate	
--------------	---------	-----	---------------------------	--

Customer Number	01041	Name	Mr Hector Munro	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Evanton 4.147 - 4.151	
Reference	Housing EV1 & Mixed Use EV3		Type	Change	Comment Late No

### Comment Changes

Reinstatement for Housing/Mixed Use and enlargement of an area previously zoned for Housing either side of the Southern approach road to Evanton namely land bounded by the River Sgitheach, Network Rail, the single track road opposite the Kiltearn Burial Ground access road turning leading to Drummond Road past Drummond Farm and by Drummond Road.

### Representation

Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan 4.147 Evanton – I wish to object most strongly with regard to the allocation of preferred status for housing within the settlement of Evanton and the inexplicable deletion of an area of land to the South West of the village zoned for housing in previous local development plans and included in The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as late as Spring 2012 (see H4 in attached Plan 1). Whilst it is perfectly understandable that The Highland Council should try to give preference to their own landholding. It is totally unrealistic to expect a developer to consider such a difficult site as EV1 Teandallon East, when not only are there far more suitable and accessible sites in the village but any potential developer in addition to purchasing the site has immediately to face a number of unique and inherent difficulties:- a) there is a sitting agricultural tenant on a full agricultural lease protected by the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Act 1991 with all the inherent rights that implies which will be subject to long and costly negotiations, ultimately ending with the tenant’s right to buy; b) the cost involved in providing a new bridge link between Drummond Road and Teandallon East will be prohibitively expensive; c) the development of the site is to be linked to land at Drummond Farm, the freehold of which is owned and controlled by the family of the very tenant occupying Teandallon. d) the landowner of Drummond Farm is only being offered very limited development for 15 homes in addition to being asked to provide land for access, greenspace and amenity areas, and for possible future expansion of the school. Hardly a recipe for a successful outcome and decision to develop. In contrast, the owners of H4 have stated that their site is readily available for development. It has in the past received outline planning for a housing scheme (lapsed) and but for the sudden onset of the current recession probably would have been developed (see attached Plan 2). H4 is immediately adjacent to the main approach to the village from the South, therefore requiring far less road infrastructure, and is close to both the School and to the centre of the village. Whilst access has been shown to be perfectly possible, extending the boundary of any housing to the South opens up far greater opportunities for not only improved external and internal road layouts but also for a well balanced design for the settlement of Evanton as a whole currently existentially developing far more to the East. The H4 land and it’s southern extension is not prime agricultural land, due to the nature of it’s topography and the size of fields it is unsuitable for modern agriculture. However, the whole area lends itself to innovative planning and landscape design, using the interesting natural land form and incorporating open space along the flood plain of the River Sgitheach and along the boundary with Network Rail If the plan is adopted in its current form The Highland Council will in effect be limiting any housing development in Evanton to one site and to high density housing at EV2 Culcairn. And they will in effect be placing a planning blight on all development to the South and West of the village. The Highland Council should accept that a previous administration, initially with good intention, bought Teandallon Farm to develop part of it, but then made the mistake of holding on to the remaining land with a view to future development, but by allowing private development to occur up the Swordale Road they inadvertently overloaded the infrastructure effectively blighting their own land. The previous administration compounded their mistake by granting a full agricultural tenancy back to the previous owner. EV1 Teandallon East has been in public ownership for in excess of thirty years during which time it has failed to be developed. The Highland Council should now accept that it is simply not going to happen, due to its inherent difficulties. There are much more suitable and accessible sites readily available for bringing the Council’s policy of providing effective and deliverable housing to fruition. To that effect I would request and recommend:- a)that preferred status be immediately reinstated to the land at H4 on Plan 1 & 2 submitted with this objection and the boundary limit of this area be extended Southwards to take in the whole of the field surrounding Sunfield. b)that some of the restrictions placed on EV3 be lifted so that this area too can be realistically considered for medium to low density housing by potential developers. I readily declare as I have in the past being a Land Agent acting for the owner of some 3.23 hectares of H4 land immediately adjacent to the River Sgitheach, but I am also a member of a family long resident in the Evanton Community with a wish to see this attractive small rural settlement thrive and develop in a sustainable way.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.147	
Reference	Consolidation of Settlement should be restricted		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Consolidation of Settlement should be restricted to Consolidation – not a massive increase in population which is not feasible nor necessary in the time span of the plan.

Representation

Consolidation of Settlement should be restricted to Consolidation – not a massive increase in population which is not feasible nor necessary in the time span of the plan.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

---

Customer Number	03864	Name	Mr Allan Moore	Organisation	Allan Moore (Drummond) Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Andrew Bennie		Bidwells	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paragraphs 1.147 – 1.151	
Reference	Site Reference, Proposals Inset Map for Evanton (p		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

“ The reinstatement of the site to the ‘South East of Evanton Bridge’, as an allocation for future residential development, this reflecting the terms of the current Local Plan land allocation which relates to the site.”

Representation

The land, which forms the basis of this objection to the provisions of the Proposed Plan is, in terms of the currently adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (As Continued in April 2012), formally allocated for residential development purposes, under the terms of site reference 6 which appears in the table on page 69 of the Plan and as shown on Inset Map 16. In line with the provisions of Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, any application submitted at this time, seeking permission for the residential development of the site would be viewed favourably, unless any relevant material considerations indicated otherwise. Whilst it is acknowledged that the most recent Flood Risk maps published by SEPA indicate that a section of the site may be subject to flood risk, the actual extent of which would require to be confirmed by detailed modeling, it is submitted that this potential development constraint would not prevent development from taking place on those parts of the wider site which are not subject to any flood risk and that given the size of the site and the relatively small number of units allocated for development, the full allocation could be delivered irrespective of this potential flood risk. Given the set out above, it is submitted that on the basis of its formal allocation for residential development purposes and in light those material considerations which relate to the site, is most likely that planning permission would be granted for an application seeking permission for the residential development of this site. In light of these considerations, it is submitted that the Council have failed to provide a suitable or justifiable explanation as to why it proposes to “de-allocate” the site within the terms of the emerging Proposed Plan. The only indication as to the reasoning behind the Council’s actions in this regard, lie within the terms of the Main Issues Report (MIR), which was published in Spring 2012. The site is identified as Site Reference H4 within the MIR, as detailed respectively, within the Table on page 77 and the Plan on page 79 of the report. The Table on page 77 of the report, under the heading of “Significant Cons”, indicates that “Most of site in flood risk area”. As has been noted above, whilst it is accepted that in light of the information contained within the relevant SEPA flood risk map, a portion of the site may be subject to flood risk, the full extent of the this flood risk cannot be determined without further more detailed modeling. In light of the sites topography and given the size of the site in relation to the extent, in numerical terms, of the existing allocation which relates to the site, which represents an average development density of only 5.3 units per hectare, it is submitted that scope exists to deliver the full extent of the existing allocation whilst at the same time taking due cognisance of the need to address the flood risk issue. On this basis, it is not accepted that the flood risk issue alone provides sufficient cause or justification to set aside or seek to remove the development allocation, which presently relates to the site. The only other “Significant Con” which has been identified in relation to this site, is the fact that it’s development would result in the loss of an area of prime agricultural land. Whilst the terms of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) indicate, at paragraph 97, that prime agricultural land should not be developed, it also makes clear that an exception to this general presumption against development exists where the land in question forms an “essential component of the settlement strategy”. As the site is formally allocated for development within the adopted Local Plan covering the same, there can be no doubt that it forms part of the strategy for the future development of Evanton and that as such, the loss of the prime agricultural land that would result from its development can be fully justified against the provisions of SPP. It is also worth noting at this point that a number of the sites that have been supported by the Council both within the MIR and the Proposed Plan also involve the development and hence loss of prime agricultural land with it being specifically noted that the agricultural quality of Proposed Plan site references EV1 And EV2 exceeds that of the site which forms the basis of this objection. Given all of the matters outlined above, it is my respectful submission that the Council have failed to provide any reasoned justification as to why the development land allocation which relates to this site, as set down within the terms of the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, the provisions of which were continued in force in relation to, amongst other things, this specific land allocation in Spring 2012. The Council has also failed to demonstrate that there are any insurmountable physical or infrastructure constraints, which would prevent the site from delivering the scale of development for which it is formally allocated. Consequently, it is submitted that the current Local Plan allocation of this site for the development of 24 dwelling houses should be reinstated within the terms of the Proposed Plan.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

4.151 kiltearn primary Concern re capacity of school, current traffic flow/ parking, option for appropriate developement of site at teandallon not being considered without pursuing developers commitment to investmentin infrastructure

Representation

4.151 The Primary School expansion, associated parking and safety concerns all point to development of Teandallon paying for all or at least the major part of the cost without it becoming a burden on the Council. I was distressed to be told by our local councillor that the lease of the land to Drummond Farm was unbreakable and this is obviously incorrect. There may be conditions of notice etc but this is not insurmountable – if the will is there – the way is there. It is imperative that this is not allowed to continue as the realised value in monetary terms and potential is enormous and beneficial to the entire community and the Regional Council. Consideration of approval in any other area would prove detrimental to the future value of Teandallon land and it is essential that this asset be exploited to the maximum before allowing gain elsewhere.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Amendment to sentence reading "Early engagement....." Suggested sentence to replace: "Early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be delivered across the planning period as part of Scottish Water's investment programme, taking into account the cumulative demand on Assynt WTW and Evanton WWTW."

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04382	Name	David Thomson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	3.Strategy for Growth Areas		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Firstly I would like to point out that the map sent to us is inaccurate in that the road leading to Culcairn House-Cottage is shown as much wider than it is. The rough track is bordered by a burn which frequently overflows and the other side of the road is shown hard against the houses known as Burnside and Fyrish. Are their gardens going to be subject to a compulsory purchase order simply to placate the owner of Novar Estate. There is a perfectly adequate road at the other side of the development. In addition I do not see the need for a development here when there is an area in Teandallon purchased many years ago for the purpose of house building. This area is much closer to the school and would from a road safety point of view be a much more suitable site.

Representation

There is no need for the amount of housing envisaged in this village. There is little enough work in the area to support this. Additionally the school could not possibly meet the needs of this extra amount of people without extensive additions to it. Parking is an additional problem at the school. Would the developer at Culcairn be willing to pay for this additional infrastructure. At peak times there is already a large volume of traffic within the village and I would also point out that at times I have waited 10 minutes to access the A9 leaving Evanton at its south approach. How much worse is this going to be with an extra 200 plus cars leaving what is already a commuter village. It would be necessary to put a roundabout on the A9 at this exit. Why has the culcairn proposed development risen from 83 houses as per the previous amendment, to 160 homes. I would ask that these comments, together with my original objections, be taken into consideration when considering these proposed plans.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04321	Name	Douglas McFee	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	EV2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

In the Statement of Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 on same area had 85 houses compared with 165 houses now. This should be reduced back to original size. Traffic access into the proposed development EV2 can only be from the north end of the development ie after Fyrish Crescent. The road shown to the east of Glenglass Road is in fact a single track farm road to Culcairn Cottage. The study indicates major structural landscaping between development EV2 and housing at east side of development. This is confusing. This landscaping should be to all existing housing as per the Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 ie Culcairn, Glenglass Road, Station Road and Fyrish Crescent The landscaping should also negate direct access between proposed development EV2 and Glenglass Road to discourage access and maintain a rural atmosphere as much as possible.

Representation

[redacted] As one of the residents most affected by the development plan for Zone EV2 in Evanton, I have attached some comments, possibly some too detailed at this time, but highly important to myself: Personally as a pensioner I am already finding this proposed development both daunting and stressful. I realise that development is essential and inevitable but the size of the developments EV1, EV2 & E3 with approx 300 homes and with a potential increase in population of say 1000+ people, effectively doubling the village size, will have a massive impact on the village and particularly the east end of the village. I purchased my home 2 years ago for my retirement and the home report showed no planning permission indicated. I was swayed into buying the property based on its quiet location and beautiful setting with unrestricted views of fields, trees and Fyrish hill. This proposed development will turn this beautiful rural setting into just another urban location The residents of Glenglass Road are all village/rural orientated people of mature age. It is highly important to protect Glenglass Road and its residents as much as possible to negate the intrusion of development EV2 with its massive population increase. This is a life changing development. I would ask the Development Team to answer and consider the following Size of development Is it the case that the size of development EV2 is purely based on the amount of land being offered by the Novar estate under the “Call for Sites”. In the Statement of Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 on same area had 85 houses compared with 165 houses now. This should be reduced back to original size. Development Priorities What type of housing is planned? Is it private or rental? Development EV1 should take 1st priority as the land is already owned by the council and the area is already integrated into the Evanton community and closer to existing facilities and schooling. What are the approximate timings and priorities for development of EV1, EV2 & EV3. i.e. 5 years/10 years/20years. Will the infrastructure changes be carried out in parallel with development? Segregation of new development EV2 Traffic access into the proposed development EV2 can only be from the north end of the development ie after Fyrish Crescent. The road shown to the east of Glenglass Road is in fact a single track farm road to Culcairn Cottage. The study indicates major structural landscaping between development EV2 and housing at east side of development. This is confusing. This landscaping should be to all existing housing as per the Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 ie Culcairn, Glenglass Road, Station Road and Fyrish Crescent The landscaping should also negate direct access between proposed development EV2 and Glenglass Road to discourage access and maintain a rural atmosphere as much as possible. Existing Pathway There is a narrow pathway running between my property and my neighbours on to the farm road between Glenglass Road and the proposed development EV2 This was put in during construction of the Glenglass Road houses. This pathway is unsurfaced and unmaintained and I am unsure if it is an official pathway. I am extremely concerned that this pathway would be used as a “rat run” to the football pitch at north side of Glenglass Road, to the Black Rock Gorge or for dog walkers. Much of the above may appear trivial to others but could have major consequences to myself and possibly other residents of Glenglass Road. I would appreciate your review of my comments and trust there can be a positive outcome. Regards Doug McFee

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	3.Strategy for Growth Areas		Paragraph	4.148	
Reference	4.148 ( general introduction)		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

consideration of contents of section 4.148, re school, , associated parking, local amenity,previously purchased and designated developement land

Representation

4.148 - Reference is made to the Novar Designed Landscape to the North but it is not clear what this implies as no changes appear to have been made in the last 30+ years There is a Primary School – close to max capacity with no treatment room and very limited space. Parking is a major problem and the deposit and uplifting of young pupils is dangerous and MUST be addressed before any life is lost. There is one convenience store , one Licensed Hotel, Sports Centre with limited parking and a Public Hall with no parking . Any Housing development should be confined to the previously designated area at East and West Teandallon on land purchased some 35 years ago for that purpose. There is only a limited demand for housing and no apparent demand for additional mixed work units.There is in any event an Industrial and mixed use area nearby at EV5.. The previously held ‘Presumption in favour of Agriculture’ should be reinstated’.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	evanton map EV2	
Reference	ev2		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

More accurate more representing current roads, lanes and pathways

Representation

Current map disproportionately represents width of small lane from Station Road to Culcairn Cottage, from which it may be falseley construed that this would represent a suitable ingress/ access to the proposed site.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04257	Name	angus craik	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.150	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

changes with reference to road network, rail stop

Representation

4.150 Upgrades of the road network is an immediate priority and can be easily achieved by being considered together with the bridge to gain access to the extremely valuable area of Teandallon, linking to Swordale road and alleviating the congestion and dangers presently being experienced in the Village. At peak times an accident is waiting to happen! A rail stop would be advantageous but the demand is not high as road transport is needed/desired here and at destination so this is not an immediate priority as parking at station becomes a problem.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	03864	Name	Mr Allan Moore	Organisation	Allan Moore (Drummond) Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Andrew Bennie		Bidwells	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Relating to Paragraphs 1.147 – 1.151	
Reference	Site Reference, Proposals Inset Map for Evanton		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

“ The allocation of that area of land lying to the east side of site reference EV3, referred to as Site Evanton NS113, Land East of MU2 within the Council’s ‘Alternative Sites and Uses’ consultation document, for residential development purposes.”

Representation

Within their assessment of the relative merits of this site, the Council has acknowledged that it does not suffer from any flood risk issues and that it lies in comparatively close proximity to the village centre and the local primary school. In terms of those considerations, which weigh against the allocation of this site for residential development purposes, the Council has sighted impact upon prime agricultural land, landscape and visual impact and the need for drainage infrastructure improvement. When these various considerations are assessed against the merits of sites within the village, which the Council had allocated for development within the Proposed Plan, it is respectfully submitted that Council has failed to provide sufficient justification as to why the site has not been brought forward as an allocation. With regards first of all to the impact upon prime quality agricultural land it is accepted that the development of the site would result in the loss of such land. This having been said, the Council is supporting development of other much larger sites within the village, Sites EV1 and EV2, both of which will result in the loss of much larger areas of prime agricultural land, which, when more detailed consideration of their agricultural capacity is taken into account, can be deemed to be of higher agricultural value than the site which forms the basis of this objection. In terms of its agricultural potential, this site is tied and limited to permanent pasture land which does not have any more valuable cropping or growing potential. The same limitation des not however exist in respect of site EV1 and EV2. Consequently, the impact in terms of loss of agricultural land is much less significant than that which is associated with the development of the other two sites stated above. On the matter of landscape and visual impact, it is considered that the site is very well contained both physically and visually and that as a direct consequence of the elevated position of the railway line which runs to the east side of the site, it is largely screened from most distant views from the south and east, particularly those gained from the A9. Closer views of the site from the A9 must of necessity been considered within the context of the development of the adjacent Site EV3, with it being submitted that in landscape and visual terms, subject to the same general form of landscape treatment as will be required in respect of the development of sites EV1 and EV2, there is no reason to assume or claim that the site cannot be successfully integrated into the surrounding landscape. On the final matter of the need to provide additional drainage infrastructure to support the development of the site, it is respectfully submitted that this constitutes a “standard” development requirement that relates to most if not all new development sites and that as such, it is not a matter that would normally count against the allocation of the site unless there were any indication that the required infrastructure could not be implemented at reasonable cost, which is not the case in this instance. In view of the matters set out above, it is respectfully submitted that the Council has failed to provide a proper and reasoned justification as to why this site has not been allocated for residential development. Further to these considerations, it is submitted that as this site is free of any constraints, which would impede or otherwise hinder its immediate development potential, which is clearly not the case in respect of other sites within the village that are included as allocations within the Proposed Plan, the allocation of this site could make a positive and meaningful contribution towards meeting the Plans housing land requirements, especially in the short term.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04321	Name	Douglas McFee	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	EV1 Teandallon	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Development EV1 should take 1st priority as the land is already owned by the council and the area is already integrated into the Evanton community and closer to existing facilities and schooling.

Representation

As one of the residents most affected by the development plan for Zone EV2 in Evanton, I have attached some comments, possibly some too detailed at this time, but highly important to myself: Personally as a pensioner I am already finding this proposed development both daunting and stressful. I realise that development is essential and inevitable but the size of the developments EV1, EV2 & E3 with approx 300 homes and with a potential increase in population of say 1000+ people, effectively doubling the village size, will have a massive impact on the village and particularly the east end of the village. I purchased my home 2 years ago for my retirement and the home report showed no planning permission indicated. I was swayed into buying the property based on its quiet location and beautiful setting with unrestricted views of fields, trees and Fyrish hill. This proposed development will turn this beautiful rural setting into just another urban location The residents of Glenglass Road are all village/rural orientated people of mature age. It is highly important to protect Glenglass Road and its residents as much as possible to negate the intrusion of development EV2 with its massive population increase. This is a life changing development.

Allocated to	Evanton	General	General	
--------------	---------	---------	---------	--