

# Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

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

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

### Comment Changes

As per representation.

### Representation

Site FR1 Greenside farm This site is good agricultural land and should be retained as agricultural land, which is a fundamental requirement for sensible and sustainable developement and is also highland council and scottish government policy. There is no overwhelming requirement or justification for building additional housing on it. The proposed developement is outwith the village area. The road access is dangerous and unsuitable. The infrastructure of the area does not support the increase in population with regards to local services, schools, traffic. The majority of work is in Inverness and the increased commuter traffic is not sustainable and is detrimental to all the villages along this route.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

### Comment Changes

FR2 requirements. FR1 - traffic management

### Representation

FR2 area includes current planning permission for a swimming pool. This is absent from the proposed plan and should be included as such a local facility is lacking in the local area. FR2 should include greater commitment to primary school, as well as capacity for further development of Fortrose Academy. I do not think the proposed retail use on this site is appropriate. Such facilities are currently concentrated on the high st where there are vacant facilities and therefore scope for further retail development /re-use within the community. I also think concentrating retail usage on the high street will best help maintain the local character of Fortrose and the Conservation Area. To accommodate the existing planning permission for the swimming pool and leave room for school(s), there would seem to be a need to reduce the housing allocation at this location, and remove the proposed retail use. FR1 - proposed plan is for possible "road closure of Courthill Road". Ongoing access is vital for current residents and, for safety of access, suggest maintaining current one way access down hill below Courthill House is maintained (or reversed so access is only uphill). Otherwise, I support FR1 as being the most appropriate site for allowing expansion of Rosemarkie if needed.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04005	Name	Philip Mudge	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR1 - Greenside Farm, Rosemarkie		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The area designated FR1, at Greenside Farm in Rosemarkie, has been noted as an area for 50 homes. I do not agree that this area should be developed for houses. It should remain as green space, with NO houses built here.

Representation

I am firmly against the proposal that 50 homes may in future be built at Greenside Farm in Rosemarkie. I have lived in Rosemarkie since my very early childhood (over 30 years), and feel that the character of the village would be irreparably damaged by such a development. The ratio of proposed new to existing houses is too high - Rosemarkie has already been well built up over the years with the new houses at Ryebank, and another 50 is simply too many. The quantity, and then the inevitable 'new-build' style of modern houses, will both contribute to damage the historical atmosphere of the village, I fear to such a point that it will no longer feel like the safe, friendly place that locals are accustomed to. The loss of green space will also have a negative impact on the village. I am also concerned that the area in question is just too small for 50 houses. This seems like gross over-development of a small parcel of land. I live very near to the proposed development site, and worry about what road access would be taken to the new houses. I have young children, and the main road is already busy enough. Courthill Road is not of a suitable state to take increased volumes of traffic, and neither is the junction. I am extremely uneasy about the thought of a huge increase in traffic right outside my property. In more general terms, traffic is also a significant concern. I feel that residents of these new houses would be commuters - there is no work locally for this number of persons, they would have to find employment outwith the vicinity - and the build-up of traffic at peak commuting times would result in chaos in Fortrose, Avoch and Munlochy High Streets. These are already cluttered with vehicles and a bottleneck when busy. More commuters will increase this problem, and add danger to the school routes. Cycling, and perhaps even walking, to school would become much more dangerous. We should be encouraging children to do this and making routes safer for them, not increasing the potential for accidents. It is also a large number of new residents for local facilities and services to cope with - will we lose water pressure? Are there enough primary and secondary school places? Can the GP's cope with the additional number of patients? Are local recycling facilities enough? If these new houses come to be built, will my children end up in overcrowded classes, and with a long wait for medical appointments because the local infrastructure cannot cope? These things need to be ascertained. I want my children to know village life as it has been for years here - I fear that if these houses are allowed to be built, then Rosemarkie will cease to be a proper village anymore.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number 01889 Name Mr James Cornwell Organisation Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59 to 4.62

Reference FR1 and FR2 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

As per representation.

#### Representation

FORTROSE & ROSEMARKIE COMMUNITY COUNCIL Response to Consultation on Proposed Plan Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council is strongly critical of the fallacious statement that expansion of housing in Fortrose is in keeping with its status as the primary service centre for the Black Isle. Strong opposition to excessive housing growth, on prime land, has been expressed at public meetings which discuss both the Main Issues Report and the current Proposed Plan. The Community Council is very aware of the landscape constraints of a narrow coastal strip; and the poor infrastructure support of excessive developments. Many detailed planning factors have been overlooked or deliberately ignored as a result of the “Tunnel Vision” approach of the planning service to maximise housing growth with little concern for its sustainability or its effect on the environment. Site FR 1 Greenside Farm. The land was identified in RACE local Plan for 30 houses and for ‘mixed uses’ in the Main Issues Report. An over-development of 50 houses at a density of 25 per hectare (a city/suburban density) with the associated infrastructure problems is entirely out of keeping with the attractive rural setting of the heritage village and Conservation Area. Its location also raises the issue of road safety on Active Travel routes to Rosemarkie shops. Any masterplan must be prepared in full consultation with the community, whose opinion must be a material planning consideration. Site FR 2 Ness Gap. The infill proposed raises the total to 156 houses for the Ness Gap and is vigorously opposed by the community which reluctantly accepted the RACE local Plan allocation of 120 house at a suitably low density to match the adjoining properties. The developer has increased the density at each phase of the programme and the Community Council has been aware since the “Call for Sites” that such adjustments to the masterplan would be a developer priority. The loss of prime land and wildlife habitats cannot be ameliorated by providing miniscule green spaces within the housing estate as outlined in the relevant Supplementary Guidance. There is an obvious detrimental impact on the amenity value of the traditional Easter Greengates Core Path, and criticism has come from tourists and residents. It is not clear whether additional affordable housing is being considered for the Ness Gap as well as for the Site at Rosemarkie. If it is, will the number of extra affordable units be based on the infill of 24 units or on 80 houses as quoted in the Plan? Both these sites are examples of over development which will have a detrimental effect on the amenities, quality of life and social balance of the separate communities of Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Infrastructure. The housing market demand is given in detail in the Plan but there are no matching figures for population. In the Black Isle land is identified for over 1070 houses. As the primary local service centre, Fortrose can expect an increase in footfall of visitors. More parking space will be needed and many other aspects of infrastructure, such as traffic management, school buildings (including the new classroom approved in the present Ness Gap development), new primary school, day care centre, medical services, public toilets and swimming pool need to be developed under POLICY 1 to PROMOTE & PROTECT the status of this former borough. The allocation of 1.6 hectares, which may or may not be required for a primary school, is quite inadequate for the Community purposes. Land was reserved for the Swimming Pool in the RACE Local Plan and MUST be reinstated in this Proposed Plan as an essential facility for an increasing Black Isle population. Settlement Development Area (SDA). There is a suggestion that Fortrose/Rosemarkie may become an SDA. In its response to the Main Issues Report the Community Council advised that the development criteria applicable to Other Settlements were equally applicable to Fortrose. The Highlandwide Local Development Plan lists the conditions that could justify establishing an SDA. The landscape constraints mentioned before, currently poor infrastructure and the quality of the agricultural land, suggest that an SDA would not benefit this communities. The proximity of the A9 Growth Corridor will be an important factor for consideration of this SDA issue. Conclusion. The Proposed Plan does not achieve the aim of Policy 1; namely to Promote and Protect Town and Local Centres. It is obsessed with growth and fails to address the consequences of the excessive developments which it proposes.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

This part of IMFLDP to be removed from plan altogether.

Representation

This would be an intrusive and out of character development within this historic area. FR1 would compound the already existing problems of traffic management, water services and access to this area of Rosemarkie.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reduce Housing Density

Representation

In the original proposals for housing at this site, a figure of 30 – 35 houses was mentioned. Now “up to 50” are included in the IMFLDP. This is an unacceptable increase of around 40% in density for this site. I am also worried about the impact of the new development on Courthill Road.

Allocated to

Customer Number	01409	Name	Mr John Hossack	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59-4.62	
Reference	Greenside Farm FR1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

1. No final decision regarding the development should be made until traffic problems through Rosemarkie are resolved, Courthill Road is appropriately upgraded and safety issues addressed (Ref 4.62). 2. Consideration should be given to ensuring that any development does not compromise the future of a possible Rosemarkie by-pass which may eventually become essential. 3. If the development is to proceed, the maximum allocation of houses should not exceed 23 and be of an appropriate architectural standard in keeping with existing housing. 4 Any hydrological survey of FR1 should be carried out by consulting engineers visibly independent of developer interests.

Representation

INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN Ref: 01409 Comments on the proposals in relation to Rosemarkie and Fortrose General As a generality, Highland Council (HC) is in danger of losing democratic legitimacy by persistently favouring commercial and developer interests at the expense of the communities it is elected to represent and protect. References to expansion ‘opportunities’ and developer interests indicate clearly where HC’s priorities lie. HC continues to display a propensity to pick and choose and, where convenient, disregard advice expensively garnered at Public Local Inquiries. Many of the comments on and objections to the previous Local Plan in respect of proposed developments at Fortrose and Rosemarkie are still valid and will not be rehearsed here. However, they remain relevant as HC has made no serious attempt to address them. Summarised in brief, these are that no further expansion takes place because: The A832 between Avoch and Fortrose is already acknowledged by HC as ‘dangerous and of a major concern’ and further expansion merely makes matters worse Fortrose High Street is not suitable (or safe) for the anticipated increased traffic flows (1) Fortrose and Rosemarkie reached their maximum, tolerable populations acceptable to the existing communities some time ago There are a number of other issues where it appears that commercial considerations seem to be favoured at the expense of interests widely held important to the communities affected. That the communities have experienced the fastest growth in the region (some 30%) is sufficient justification for further aggressive expansion is a HC boast too far. Road and street traffic capacity issues have long been a ‘major concern’ but HC chose to discard the advice offered by a Reporter a generation ago that no further expansion should take place until the Avoch-Fortrose road was upgraded. HC seems resolved to strain its democratic mandate beyond that which commands consent. Greenside development (FR1) HC is reminded that in the consultation phase of the preceding plan, a petition in Rosemarkie raised over 100 objectors to this development and that HC was unable to point to single instance of a community resident without a financial interest expressing support for the development. HC scornfully disregarded the petition but local sentiment remains unchanged. If HC wished to re-establish its democratic credentials, it might wish to test local opinion. What has changed since the previous consultation is the proposal to build 50 houses rather than the 30-35 proposed in the previous Plan. Even this latter density was considered by many to be excessive. The new proposal equates to a building density of 26.3 houses/ha at Greenside (FR1). At the Ness Gap (FR2), the housing density proposed is 13.5 houses/ha. If this density were to apply to FR1, only 23 houses would be appropriate. It is difficult to see how the proposed density could be achieved without it being ‘dormitory housing’ which HC says it has no wish to create (2). The planned housing density at Greenside is totally unacceptable and should be reduced by at least half. The proposed local plan refers to the developer being responsible (and presumably paying) for a hydrological survey of the site. This is not merely odd but may lend credence to the suspicion that whoever pays the piper, calls the tune. To believe otherwise is naive. The HC, as the authority vested with the responsibility for planning, should consider employing professional, consulting engineers, independent of all parties so that the community may have confidence in the drainage provision when the developer is long gone. If the development at Greenside (FR1) is to proceed, the community of Rosemarkie will expect HC to respect its previous acceptance that the architecture exemplified at Greenside Avenue and Ryebank was of a disappointing standard and would not be replicated in FR1. Should it proceed, the proposed development must meet higher standards and also reflect the character of existing housing already in that area (3). Courthill Road The Development Plan makes no specific reference to Courthill Road other than a possibility of closure. There is a vague and totally inadequate mention of ‘a need to consider the implications of further development on the local road network . . .’ There is no indication as to who will do the considering. This ‘consideration’ must be visibly independent and not subject to developer interference. HC should also be aware that Courthill Road, designated ‘Access Only’ with ‘No Entry’ at the northern end, single-track, occasionally flooded, rutted and potholed, one way over part of its length with a gradient of 10-15% in places, in effect, already serves (illegally) as a de facto by-pass for Rosemarkie. This state of affairs has come about since HC reduced the High Street in Rosemarkie to a single carriageway chicane on which traffic comes to a halt whenever a bus stops and fares are negotiated or commercial vehicles service local shops. Road users, frustrated by the frequent delays to traffic on the High Street, see Courthill Road as a fast-track to and from the rest of the Black Isle. HC should be aware that

a serious accident is waiting to happen on Courthill and the present situation cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. If Courthill Road is closed as suggested, the situation on Rosemarkie High Street, with its elaborate chicane may become untenable when through traffic currently (improperly) on Courthill Road is re-directed along the High Street. The prospect of a Rosemarkie by-pass may not be that long deferred. Since the only possible route for a true by-pass lies through the proposed Greenside (FR1) development, the preferred advice should be that plans for that development be abandoned until such time as Rosemarkie’s severe traffic problems are resolved. If it decides to proceed with FR1, even with a reduced number of houses, HC should ensure that an appropriate road lay-out is planned so that a by-pass is not rendered impossible in future. This requires only the exercise of intelligent anticipation of future traffic needs and may be easily achieved by arranging a lay-out which complies with statutory guidance through the proposed housing development with adequate width and appropriate verge provision. Posterity will not deal kindly with HC (or its successors) if it falls short of this requirement or fails to demonstrate adequate forward planning. All that is sought, if the FR1 development is to proceed, is that HC make explicit a commitment that the planned road lay-out at least does not preclude for all time the possibility of a Rosemarkie by-pass which may be needed eventually. It is now time for HC to come off the fence and declare unequivocally whether it is prepared to make such provision or make explicit its opposition to a by-pass for all time recognising that such opposition irrevocably affects future generations whose needs and aspirations HC seems prepared to compromise. To restore community confidence that its concerns are taken seriously, HC should retain consulting engineers (visibly independent) to assess the issues raised here in relation to the intended development and to offer proposals to protect Rosemarkie’s future. If HC comes to a decision driven by short term expediency or developer interests, it should not be surprised at the obloquy which will surely follow and it will forever be held accountable for the outcome. The community expects its elected representatives to protect its interests from unrestrained expansion and awaits HC’s decision. Summary: HC should restrain developer zeal and accept the recommendation of an earlier Reporter that there should be no further development in Fortrose and Rosemarkie until such time as the widely perceived ‘dangerous’ A832 between Avoch and Fortrose is upgraded and problems with Fortrose High Street adequately resolved. Should HC choose to disregard earlier advice and permit further development, then no more than 23 houses of an appropriate architectural standard should be built at Greenside (FR1) thereby conforming to the housing density proposed for the Ness Gap (FR2). If (and when) it is decided that the development at Greenside (FR1) should proceed, the road lay-out should be such that a possible by-pass connecting Rosemarkie to the rest of the Black Isle is not forever precluded by poor planning decisions taken at this time. HC should give serious consideration to a future Rosemarkie by-pass even if this is to be long delayed. In order to ensure that any such decision is recognisably objective and command local acceptance, HC must seek independent advice on a matter that is, one way or another, irrevocable. As a matter of urgency, the hazards associated with Courthill Road must be fully addressed. Addendum 1. Reporter 2005, Section 31 ‘Regarding the infrastructure, the weight of objections suggests that the biggest issue is the road capacity. It is unfortunate that there is no timetable for the improvement of the Avoch to Fortrose section of the A832, but the council says that it is committed to this. And I note that designs have been prepared including the provision of cycle lanes’ – and yet the evidence appears that the council is NOT committed to this. Current traffic volume in Fortrose is ~4000/day and the capacity is reduced to ~1500 by on street parking. Reporter suggests: ‘The roads authority will examine a suitable traffic management scheme with the local community and developers. There will be a presumption against significant additional development taking place until the scheme has been implemented.’ 2. Reporter 2005, Section 9 ‘The Council says it has no wish or policy approach to create dormitory housing in the local plan area.’ 3. Reporter 2005, Section 21 ‘On my site inspection I visited Greenside Avenue and Rye Bank, referred to at the discussion and in written submissions. These recent developments are uncharacteristic of Rosemarkie and would be inappropriate at Greenside Farm. The council acknowledges this, and design is referred to in the developer requirements, pointing out that it must take account of the surroundings.’

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	04269	Name	Helen & Michael Duffy	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59-4.62	
Reference	FR1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Either withdrawal of or substantial reduction in size of proposed development in rosemarkie

Representation

Section 4.59 of The inner moray firth local development plan states that all development must be within the scale and character of conservation area. While the site at Greenside is technically outside the central conservation area of Rosemarkie, the scale of the development is completely out of proportion to Rosemarkie and 50 new dwellings will impact substantially upon the character of the village, and community. The potential increase in traffic (both in Rosemarkie and passing through Avoch and Fortrose) from a further 50 dwellings is likely to be substantial. Rosemarkie already struggles to accommodate he current traffic throughput, with congestion caused by buses or deliveries, and lack of pavement due to historic nature of the High Street meaning that pedestrian safety is compromised. Increase volume of traffic on these small A roads is likely to result in increased risk to pedestrians. With the secondary school in fortrose, there are a large number of children walking to and from school both within the villages and across the Ness Gap, and further development within Fortrose and Rosemarkie will potentially increase traffic beyond capacity of the high streets and put children at risk. as most commuter traffic will be to the A9 and beyond, there will be similar impact on road safety in Avoch, with its primary school. It is for these reasons that we object to the proposed development FR1, and suggest it should be withdrawn or substantially smaller.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	01085	Name	Ms Deborah Guthrie	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59-4.62	
Reference	FR1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

#### Comment Changes

1. Reduction in area of land cited as remaining the 'best option for growth'.
2. Reduction in the number of houses proposed on this environmentally sensitive site.
3. No development considered before infrastructure issues addressed in full.

#### Representation

I would like to raise three points of objection on the view stated in the plan suggesting the land at Greenside Farm continues to represent the ‘best option for growth’ to the village of Rosemarkie. Each point of objection poses a fundamental question on this land being developed in the manner and scale proposed and each of these I would respectively ask to be answered. If such answers reference decisions taken by committee which purport to justify the apparent disregard of planning policy (relevant extracts of which are shown below inset in italics), could I please ask for copies of the meeting minutes to be attached or included in your responses as should the issues raised be escalated, such background needs to be fully understood beyond the previous simple statements of decision released by the Council? My objections/questions are >

- The proposed development area does not represent a logical extension of the village – it forms a very obvious protrusion on the existing village boundary. The logical development of housing and expansion of the village would be as shown below, continuing the lines of housing on the two areas and filling gaps between existing houses.

see attached map

a.The issue of flood risk in the area at the Western end of Courthill Road can be eliminated with the appropriate type of housing and land drainage.

b.Development as shown contains the boundary of the village, constitutes the same area as proposed and spreads the housing more sympathetically to the existing lines of development.

c.Importantly, development in these two areas respects and would be consistent with Planning Policy regarding Conservation Village Areas, SSSI's and Greenfield sites.

I would like to ask how the Planning Committee consider the proposed area of development land at Greenside Farm to be acceptable when it forms no logical extension to the village, directly adjoins the conservation area of the village and a listed Designed Landscape and SSSI and is high grade agricultural land? We will also judge proposals in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development and landscape character, how they conform with existing and approved adjacent land uses ... Essentially the purpose of the designations is to exert greater control over the siting and design of proposed development. ....planning authorities have a duty to bring forward proposals for the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas, Development within the designated Outstanding Conservation Area should be carried out in accordance with the established character of the area ... .... have regard for the Designed Landscape of the Fairy Glen Paragraph 6.37 safeguards good quality agricultural land and viable farm units on the periphery of the settlements, notably at Broomhill and Greenside, from development unrelated to the working of these areas fore agricultural purposes.
- The suggested housing capacity of this area of land as stated at 50 units on 1.9 ha equates to an average 380 sq m per house. This density of housing is twice that of the proposed development FR2 Ness Gap, is unprecedented in both Rosemarkie and Fortrose, is at the level of inner urban development and does not comply with the Council’s stated expectations or national Planning Advice. Up to 2 hectares of land is allocated for 30 to 35 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings. As a guideline, the THC will normally expect a maximum plot ratio of 30% (i.e. no more than 30% of plot being covered by buildings) ... This is also consistent with the latest national advice contained in Planning Advice Note 67. The impact of development on the wider landscape needs to be considered and to ensure that the scale of new development in smaller towns and villages is appropriate. How has this housing capacity been decided and how has the number of houses increased from the originally stated level of 30 units to a number which within the footprint of the land in question results in housing density greatly exceeding Planning Advice? The fact that demolition of the farm buildings at Greenside Farm has commenced would appear to suggest the owners of the land have already sold an ‘option to buy’ subject to planning approval and the increase in housing density points to prior dialogue with the developer and the Planning Department on the commercial need for a higher level of housing capacity to make this development viable from the developer’s standpoint.
- Development of the density proposed on the 1.9ha at Greenside Farm presents serious issues in respect to infrastructure both in the immediate proximity to the development on Courthill Road and for the village centres of Rosemarkie and Fortrose. First there is the issue of road access and traffic, Courthill Road being a single track, access only and partially one-way road with no possibility to be widened. Secondly, there is a pre-existing traffic problem on the main streets of both villages which can only be made worse with additional housing unless alleviated through appropriate measures in advance of further development. Finally, as confirmed in the IMFLDP itself, development on the scale proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing water supply. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity) ... Why does the Planning Authority not require infrastructure to be addressed in advance of considering further development in the



area? ----- One last point – and this is a fundamental matter. The Planning Department has the authority to manage and control development and there is, as with all development, the opportunity to exercise best practice in building ... Respecting the landscape setting and the traditional building patterns of the locality and considering the immediate context and allowing specific site conditions to influence design – as stated by the Scottish Government. Whilst it is accepted the matter in discussion at this point is focused on options for housing development, please at the relevant stage can it be recognised there is a need to enhance and build community as opposed to simply build houses. Today there can be no excuse given on cost constraints – it is down to the resolve of the Planning Department to follow their own clear development directives and ensure outcomes deliver more than an increase in housing stock. It can be done as evidenced by developments such as Burnside in Plockton.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 00491 Name Myra Carus Organisation Highland and Islands Green Party

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 82

Reference FR1 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Reconsider the development. In particular the density of housing to be built.

Representation

In the original proposals for housing at this site, a figure of 30 – 35 houses was mentioned. Now “up to 50” are included in the IMFLDP. This is an unacceptable increase of around 40% in density for this site. There are also serious issues regarding drainage on the site and the impact on Courthill Road.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 03807 Name Paula Sime Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference FR1 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Lower housing density

Representation

50 new homes on Courthill Road will bring at least 50 new cars to the area. Courthill Road is a deeply unpleasant road, and the lower exit on to Bridge street is dangerous due to the restricted visibility. I am also worried about the impact on the community as a whole. Rosemarkie is a very small community, and I feel that 50 new homes will have a large impact on the village, and combined with the proposed levels of new homes being built in Fortrose, the impact on local services could be disastrous.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The density of housing for the site is stated to be 50 which is considered to be a gross over development of what is an open rural area immediately adjacent to open farmland and countryside of conservation value. While 50 residences may be an appropriate density for a town or city it would be more appropriate for a density of 20 to 30 residences of no more than one and a half storey in the detailed location.

Representation

The proposed density for the area of the plan should be reduced to 30 residences of no more than one and a half storey

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Site FR1 Greenside farm This site is good agricultural land and should be retained as agricultural land, which is a fundamental requirement for sensible and sustainable developement and is also highland council and scottish government policy. There is no overwhelming requirement or justification for building additional housing on it. The proposed developement is outwith the village area. The road access is dangerous and unsuitable. The infrastructure of the area does not support the increase in population with regards to local services, schools, traffic. The majority of work is in Inverness and the increased commuter traffic is not sustainable and is detrimental to all the villages along this route.

Allocated to

Customer Number	01199	Name	Mr David Guthrie	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59-4.62	
Reference	FR1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

1. Reduction in the area of land proposed for development. 2. Consideration of additional land area for development. 3. Reduction in the number of houses considered.

Representation

I would like to raise three points of objection on the view stated in the plan suggesting the land at Greenside Farm continues to represent the ‘best option for growth’ to the village of Rosemarkie. Each point of objection poses a fundamental question on this land being developed in the manner and scale proposed and each of these I would respectively ask to be answered. If such answers reference decisions taken by committee which purport to justify the apparent disregard of planning policy (relevant extracts of which are shown below inset in italics), could I please ask for copies of the meeting minutes to be attached or included in your responses as should the issues raised be escalated, such background needs to be fully understood beyond the previous simple statements of decision released by the Council? My objections/questions are >

1.The proposed development area does not represent a logical extension of the village – it forms a very obvious protrusion on the existing village boundary. The logical development of housing and expansion of the village would be as shown below, continuing the lines of housing on the two areas and filling gaps between existing houses. SEE ATTACHED PLAN

a.The issue of flood risk in the area at the Western end of Courthill Road can be eliminated with the appropriate type of housing and land drainage. b.Development as shown contains the boundary of the village, constitutes the same area as proposed and spreads the housing more sympathetically to the existing lines of development. c.Importantly, development in these two areas respects and would be consistent with Planning Policy regarding Conservation Village Areas, SSSI’s and Greenfield sites. I would like to ask how the Planning Committee consider the proposed area of development land at Greenside Farm to be acceptable when it forms no logical extension to the village, directly adjoins the conservation area of the village and a listed Designed Landscape and SSSI and is high grade agricultural land? We will also judge proposals in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development and landscape character, how they conform with existing and approved adjacent land uses ... Essentially the purpose of the designations is to exert greater control over the siting and design of proposed development. ....planning authorities have a duty to bring forward proposals for the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas, Development within the designated Outstanding Conservation Area should be carried out in accordance with the established character of the area ... .... have regard for the Designed Landscape of the Fairy Glen Paragraph 6.37 safeguards good quality agricultural land and viable farm units on the periphery of the settlements, notably at Broomhill and Greenside, from development unrelated to the working of these areas fore agricultural purposes.

2.The suggested housing capacity of this area of land as stated at 50 units on 1.9 ha equates to an average 380 sq m per house. This density of housing is twice that of the proposed development FR2 Ness Gap, is unprecedented in both Rosemarkie and Fortrose, is at the level of inner urban development and does not comply with the Council’s stated expectations or national Planning Advice. Up to 2 hectares of land is allocated for 30 to 35 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings. As a guideline, the THC will normally expect a maximum plot ratio of 30% (i.e. no more than 30% of plot being covered by buildings) ... This is also consistent with the latest national advice contained in Planning Advice Note 67. The impact of development on the wider landscape needs to be considered and to ensure that the scale of new development in smaller towns and villages is appropriate. How has this housing capacity been decided and how has the number of houses increased from the originally stated level of 30 units to a number which within the footprint of the land in question results in housing density greatly exceeding Planning Advice? The fact that demolition of the farm buildings at Greenside Farm has commenced would appear to suggest the owners of the land have already sold an ‘option to buy’ subject to planning approval and the increase in housing density points to prior dialogue with the developer and the Planning Department on the commercial need for a higher level of housing capacity to make this development viable from the developer’s standpoint.

3.Development of the density proposed on the 1.9ha at Greenside Farm presents serious issues in respect to infrastructure both in the immediate proximity to the development on Courthill Road and for the village centres of Rosemarkie and Fortrose. First there is the issue of road access and traffic, Courthill Road being a single track, access only and partially one-way road with no possibility to be widened. Secondly, there is a pre-existing traffic problem on the main streets of both villages which can only be made worse with additional housing unless alleviated through appropriate measures in advance of further development. Finally, as confirmed in the IMFLDP itself, development on the scale proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing water supply. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity) ... Why does the Planning Authority not require infrastructure to be addressed in advance of considering further development in the area? -----

One last point – and this is a fundamental matter. The Planning Department has the

authority to manage and control development and there is, as with all development, the opportunity to exercise best practice in building ... Respecting the landscape setting and the traditional building patterns of the locality and considering the immediate context and allowing specific site conditions to influence design – as stated by the Scottish Government. Whilst it is accepted the matter in discussion at this point is focused on options for housing development, please at the relevant stage can it be recognised there is a need to enhance and build community as opposed to simply build houses. Today there can be no excuse given on cost constraints – it is down to the resolve of the Planning Department to follow their own clear development directives and ensure outcomes deliver more than an increase in housing stock. It can be done as evidenced by developments such as Burnside in Plockton.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	00981	Name	Mr Gordon Grant	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	-----------------	--------------	--

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

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

Paragraph	Para 4.59
-----------	-----------

Reference	FR1 Rosemarkie housing
-----------	------------------------

Type	Change
------	--------

Comment Late	No
--------------	----

Comment Changes

This land should not be used for housing.
---

#### Representation

The area proposed is good agricultural land.The housing is of much greater density than adjacent housing. It is not easily accessed by foot from the center of the village. it will increase traffic flows on already overloaded village and town center roads of Rosemarkie, Fortrose, Avoch and Munlochy. it will increase commuting to Inverness.
--

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	04468	Name	Diane Kinnear	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Riarachaidhean Leasachaidh		Paragraph		
Reference	FR1 & CU2 (with reference to FR1 site)		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

Build the road proposed in previous Black Isle Plan for this area. The 50 proposed houses are 45 houses too many for this conservation area – see paragraphs 4.60 (1st sentence) and 4.61 (1st sentence) on Pg 80 of the Development Allocations. A road to relieve the conjection of traffic in Rosemarkie High Street is far more necessary than extra housing. CU2 - No change sought here but see attached

#### Representation

What has happened to the green belt? This is part of the best agricultural land on the Black Isle and should not be used to build houses. We have lived in this house since it was built in 1978/79 and it amazes me at the number of vehicles which stop opposite my window people get out, admire the view and take photographs of the animals in the field or the round bales at harvest or even the trees and wildlife at the top of the hill. I doubt they would stop to photograph a housing estate. Since we moved here in July 1979 we have had water pressure problems. The water treatment plant was sited in the wrong place at the beginning. The local infrastructure is not working for the community at present far or less the proposed influx of people. The roads have not been constructed to survive the wear and tear caused by the increasing size of heavy vehicles and are badly maintained once potholes appear. The public transport does not cater for working population who do not have their own vehicle or those in Rosemarkie who need to use bus to get to doctor, post office, shops and leisure centre in Fortrose. Carry on building at Ness Gap and leave Rosemarkie alone. This site CU2 at Culbokie has an area of 2.3ha and a proposed housing capacity of 4. The FR1 Greenside Farm Site in Rosemarkie has an area of 1.9ha and a proposed housing capacity of 50 – this is farmland not forestry. Also Site ML2 Brae Farm at Munlochy has an area of 3.4ha housing capacity 41. How do you explain 50 houses in 1.9ha at Rosemarkie?

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	01888	Name	Gwyn Phillips	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	FR1		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

Density of Housing on Greenside Farm

#### Representation

In the last local plan, 35 house were to be allowed on this site but this is now increased to 50. The housing density is unacceptable and out of keeping with the area and of this conservation village.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	04009	Name	Greg Mudge	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Remove the housing allocation at Greenside Farm or substantially reduce the housing capacity from 50 down to 10-15.

Representation

An allocation of 50 houses at this location is disproportionately high in relation to the size of the village of Rosemarkie. This would overwhelm the village, its traffic and its services. Furthermore, the area indicated on the map does not appear to be sufficiently large to accommodate 50 houses. If 50 houses were to be built here I suspect the footprint would be substantially larger than the area indicated.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	01199	Name	Mr David Guthrie	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR1 (Fortrose /Rosemarkie)		Type	Change	Comment Late

Comment Changes

Remove FR1 from the IMFLDP

## Representation

I would like to raise three points of objection on the view stated in the plan suggesting the land at Greenside Farm continues to represent the ‘best option for growth’ to the village of Rosemarkie. Each point of objection poses a fundamental question on this land being developed in the manner and scale proposed and each of these I would respectively ask to be answered. If such answers reference decisions taken by committee which purport to justify the apparent disregard of planning policy (relevant extracts of which are shown below inset in italics), could I please ask for copies of the meeting minutes to be attached or included in your responses as should the issues raised be escalated, such background needs to be fully understood beyond the previous simple statements of decision released by the Council? My objections/questions are > 1. The proposed development area does not represent a logical extension of the village – it forms a very obvious protrusion on the existing village boundary. The logical development of housing and expansion of the village would be as shown below, continuing the lines of housing on the two areas and filling gaps between existing houses. a. The issue of flood risk in the area at the Western end of Courthill Road can be eliminated with the appropriate type of housing and land drainage. b. Development as shown contains the boundary of the village, constitutes the same area as proposed and spreads the housing more sympathetically to the existing lines of development. c. Importantly, development in these two areas respects and would be consistent with Planning Policy regarding Conservation Village Areas, SSSI’s and Greenfield sites. I would like to ask how the Planning Committee consider the proposed area of development land at Greenside Farm to be acceptable when it forms no logical extension to the village, directly adjoins the conservation area of the village and a listed Designed Landscape and SSSI and is high grade agricultural land? We will also judge proposals in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development and landscape character, how they conform with existing and approved adjacent land uses ...Essentially the purpose of the designations is to exert greater control over the siting and design of proposed development. ....planning authorities have a duty to bring forward proposals for the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas, Development within the designated Outstanding Conservation Area should be carried out in accordance with the established character of the area ..... have regard for the Designed Landscape of the Fairy Glen Paragraph 6.37 safeguards good quality agricultural land and viable farm units on the periphery of the settlements, notably at Broomhill and Greenside, from development unrelated to the working of these areas fore agricultural purposes. 2. The suggested housing capacity of this area of land as stated at 50 units on 1.9 ha equates to an average 380 sq m per house. This density of housing is twice that of the proposed development FR2 Ness Gap, is unprecedented in both Rosemarkie and Fortrose, is at the level of inner urban development and does not comply with the Council’s stated expectations or national Planning Advice. Up to 2 hectares of land is allocated for 30 to 35 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings. As a guideline, the THC will normally expect a maximum plot ratio of 30% (i.e. no more than 30% of plot being covered by buildings) ... This is also consistent with the latest national advice contained in Planning Advice Note 67. The impact of development on the wider landscape needs to be considered and to ensure that the scale of new development in smaller towns and villages is appropriate. How has this housing capacity been decided and how has the number of houses increased from the originally stated level of 30 units to a number which within the footprint of the land in question results in housing density greatly exceeding Planning Advice? The fact that demolition of the farm buildings at Greenside Farm has commenced would appear to suggest the owners of the land have already sold an ‘option to buy’ subject to planning approval and the increase in housing density points to prior dialogue with the developer and the Planning Department on the commercial need for a higher level of housing capacity to make this development viable from the developer’s standpoint. 3. Development of the density proposed on the 1.9ha at Greenside Farm presents serious issues in respect to infrastructure both in the immediate proximity to the development on Courthill Road and for the village centres of Rosemarkie and Fortrose. First there is the issue of road access and traffic, Courthill Road being a single track, access only and partially one-way road with no possibility to be widened. Secondly, there is a pre-existing traffic problem on the main streets of both villages which can only be made worse with additional housing unless alleviated through appropriate measures in advance of further development. Finally, as confirmed in the IMFLDP itself, development on the scale proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing water supply. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity) ...Why does the Planning Authority not require infrastructure to be addressed in advance of considering further development in the area? One last point – and this is a fundamental matter. The Planning Department has the authority to manage and control development and there is, as with all development, the opportunity to exercise best practice in building ... Respecting the

landscape setting and the traditional building patterns of the locality and considering the immediate context and allowing specific site conditions to influence design – as stated by the Scottish Government. Whilst it is accepted the matter in discussion at this point is focused on options for housing development, please at the relevant stage can it be recognised there is a need to enhance and build community as opposed to simply build houses. Today there can be no excuse given on cost constraints – it is down to the resolve of the Planning Department to follow their own clear development directives and ensure outcomes deliver more than an increase in housing stock. It can be done as evidenced by developments such as Burnside in Plockton.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	04088	Name	John Donaldson	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	----------------	--------------	--

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

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	4.62
---------	---------------------------	-----------	------

Reference	FR1	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
-----------	-----	------	--------	--------------	----

#### Comment Changes

I would like the housing allocation FR1 removed from the Proposed Plan.

#### Representation

I would suggest that to designate the FR1 zone as a medium density development (an equivalence gleaned from Highland Council's Torvean and Ness-side development brief) , is no less than preposterous. The character of Rosemarkie is such that to build 50 houses on a 1.9 hectare site would be tantamount to vandalism on a grand scale. (The proposed Ness Gap extension in Fortrose (FR2) has 80 homes within a 5.9 ha site, a vastly reduced density when compared with the Rosemarkie proposals). The village already has natural boundaries, which are established by the shoreline, the surrounding topography and the less than satisfactory road network. When viewed on the plan, it is clear that planners are trying to inappropriately squeeze as many homes as they can into a very small area, which would destroy the character of that area of Rosemarkie. The proposal for FR1 actually looks like a "carbuncle" , which extends outwith the natural boundaries described above. I am equally concerned at the impact on infrastructure of the overall number of new houses proposed for Fortrose and Rosemarkie as a whole. In particular, none of the previously promised road or traffic management improvements have been implemented on the A832 road which already presents dangers to motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. Notwithstanding the main road traffic problems, little has been said of the access to Courthill Road from the A832, other than some vague notion of "stopping up" Courthill Road. Courthill Road is a single track road with no passing places - to increase the traffic flow would need a redesign of a very dangerous junction, as well as an upgrading of the road and drainage (of which there is none currently). It is my view that the designation for housing in FR1 should be removed, as it would destroy the character and boundaries of the village, and would be eventually used as a lever for pernicious creeping of the development further along the rear of the existing Courthill Road dwellings.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--



Customer Number	04468	Name	Diane Kinnear	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Riarachaidhean Leasachaidh	Paragraph	4.62		
Reference	FR3 Cemetery Extension	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

#### Comment Changes

The surrounding area next to the cemetery was allocated for housing in the previous Black Isle Plan. Cemetery would need to expand northwards rather than eastwards due to ground table water extending from Manse Loch, nest to wrongly sited water treatment plant.

#### Representation

The north west and west side of FR1 Greenside Farm would make a better cemetery next to Hawkshill than a housing estate. It would look better as well. On page 145 of 4. Development Allocations it states 4.159 In accommodating development there is a need to maintain the landscape setting particularly open sloping land on the east that provides attractive public views towards the Bay. The same can be said of the view from our house in Rosemarkie although the view is to the north and north east oat Greenside Farm looking up the hill to the trees at the top

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	01042	Name	Ms Lesley Grant	Organisation	Scorielea Self Catering
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	Para 4.59Fortrose & Rosemarkie		
Reference	Site FR1	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

#### Comment Changes

The Housing development proposed for Rosemarkie should not be approved

#### Representation

The land for this development is prime agricultural land. and should be retained for that purpose, in accordance with Highland Council and the Scottish Government policy not to build on agricultural land. It will encourage commuting by car to Inverness and the areas to the north of the Black Isle. It will increase traffic on the high streets of Fortrose, Rosemarkie and the villages between there and Inverness that are not capable of dealing with existing traffic flows let alone further increases in traffic.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	04133	Name	Susan Blease	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paras 4.59 - 4.62: but only the FR1 allocation	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

1. Reduction in density of the number of homes allocated for the FR1 Greenside Farm site. 2. No allocation for a particular number of houses (however "purely indicative" the plan may state the number to be) before the Authority is satisfied that this number can be accommodated without compromising road safety along Courthill Road. 3. No allocation for a particular number of houses (however "purely indicative" the plan may state the number to be) before the Authority is certain that there is/are feasible solutions(s) to the water pressure issues.

Representation

Subject to our concerns relating to road safety and water pressure being adequately addressed, we do not object to the principle of housing development on the FR1 Greenside Farm, Rosemarkie site. We do, however, object to the density of the housing development proposed on the FR1 site. In the adopted RACE LP, the final boundary of the area allocated for building houses at Greenside Farm was more or less the same as is now proposed in the FR1 allocation. We assume that the increase from the RACE LP designation of 1.7 hectares to the proposed FR1 designation of 1.9 hectares, has arisen because of greater accuracy of measurement (plus the inclusion of Greenside House itself and the originally-proposed access area within the proposed FR1 boundary). In relation to density, the indicative capacity in the RACE LP was “30 houses” on the then allocated 1.7 hectare area. The current proposal in FR1 is for “50 homes” on the now proposed 1.9 hectare area. Even allowing for the fact that some of the proposed “50 homes” are likely to be flatted properties, this is an exceptionally high density of houses and flats for this particular site. We consider that in terms of any reasonable planning assessment, the FR1 site should be regarded as an edge-of-village/semi-rural site. The proposed density of 50 homes is, however, akin to the density one might expect on an edge-of-city or indeed an inner-city site. This is not an appropriate density in this location, particularly since the site is a gateway to the village. Further, the proposed density would not be in keeping with the pattern of existing housing along the rest of Courthill Road. In addition, from the house known as “The Old School” north-eastwards, the properties on Courthill Road form part of the Rosemarkie Outstanding Conservation Area. As well as being a gateway site to the village, the FR1 site therefore forms part of the setting of the Outstanding Conservation Area and is accordingly an area where such high density of housing is inappropriate. Finally, the FR1 site also borders part of the Fairy Glen Designed Landscape and the high density of housing proposed is also inappropriate on what is part of the setting of a Designed Landscape. Secondly, we further object on the basis that there appears to have been no proper assessment of the feasibility of accommodating the proposed high density of housing development without compromising road safety along Courthill Road. An allocation for this density of housing is accordingly premature. We appreciate that detailed transport assessment and mitigation proposals would be required as part of any masterplan/development brief to be agreed for the site following adoption of the IMFLDP. However, the known deficiencies and constraints affecting Courthill Road, and the feasibility of overcoming these satisfactorily, ought surely to be properly assessed before allocating the FR1 site for such a high number of new homes. If the Authority allocates the site for 50 new homes without first being satisfied that the deficiencies of Courthill Road can be overcome, and if it then turns out that these deficiencies cannot be satisfactorily overcome, there is a genuine risk that sub-standard road solutions will be accepted, and that road safety will be compromised, under pressure to permit the development of 50 new homes to proceed. We consider it imprudent, therefore, that detailed assessment of road arrangements to accommodate 50 new homes should be required only after the site has been allocated for this number of homes. Of particular concern is the junction of Courthill Road with Bridge Street. While there will be land available to improve the junction at the Manse Brae end, there is no scope to improve the dangerously inadequate visibility splay at the junction with Bridge Street. Consequently, arrangements in respect of the proposed 50 new homes would have to be such as to ensure no increase in vehicular use of that junction. We fail to see how this could be achieved. While there is mention in the FR1 "Requirements" section of “road closure for Courthill Road”, the junction at Bridge Street cannot be stopped up unless two-way traffic can safely be accommodated along the length of Courthill Road, from the Gordon Memorial Hall to the junction with Manse Brae/Rosemarkie Road. However, such a two-way system cannot be achieved because of existing pinch points, particularly where the road starts to descend steeply at the house known as “Courthill”. There is no way of widening the road at that point to accommodate two-way traffic as on the one side there is a steep descent into the rear gardens of the houses on the High Street and on the other side sits the high retaining wall forming the boundary of the garden pertaining to “Courthill”. Once a 50 home allocation is adopted in the IMFLDP, the principle that 50 additional homes can be accommodated on the FR1 site will be established, leaving the Authority little room then to resist an application for 50 homes on the site on road safety grounds. We fear there is a genuine risk that inadequate solutions to the road constraints may then be accepted on the basis that the principle of a 50 home development has already

been established and agreed in the IMFLDP. We feel that the Courthill Road constraints, and the feasibility of any solutions to them, should therefore be fully assessed before any allocation of the FR1 site for 50 homes. We note that a solution requires to be found to water pressure issues and, while the installation of a new link water main to service the development is mentioned, there is no mention of whether the feasibility of any such solution has been checked. For reasons similar to those expressed at point 2. above, we feel that the Planning Authority should ensure that feasible solutions to the water pressure issues exist before an allocation of the site for 50 homes is adopted and the principle of a 50 home development on the site thereby established.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	04131	Name	Kirk Tudhope	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paras 4.59 - 4.62 but only on allocation FR1	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

### Comment Changes

1. Reduction in density of homes proposed for the FR1 site 2. No allocation of a particular number of homes (however indicative the plan states the number may be) before an adequate assessment that this number can be accommodated without compromising road safety on Courthill Road 3. No allocation of a particular number of homes (however indicative the plan states this number may be) before the Authority is certain that their exist solutions to the water pressure issues referred to.

### Representation

Subject to our concerns relating to road safety and water pressure issues below being adequately addressed, we do not object to the principle of housing development on the FR1 Greenside Farm, Rosemarkie site. We do, however, object to the density of the housing development proposed on the FR1 site. In the adopted RACE LP, the final boundary of the area allocated for building houses at Greenside Farm was more or less the same as is now proposed in the FR1 allocation. We assume that the increase from the RACE LP designation of 1.7 hectares to the proposed FR1 designation of 1.9 hectares, has arisen because of greater accuracy of measurement (plus the inclusion of Greenside House itself and the originally-proposed access area within the proposed FR1 boundary). In relation to density, the indicative capacity in the RACE LP was “30 houses” on the then allocated 1.7 hectare area. The current proposal in FR1 is for “50 homes” on the now proposed 1.9 hectare area. Even allowing for the fact that some of the proposed “50 homes” are likely to be flatted properties, this is an exceptionally high density of houses and flats for this particular site. We consider that in terms of any reasonable planning assessment, the FR1 site should be regarded as an edge-of-village/semi-rural site. The proposed density of 50 homes is, however, akin to the density one might expect on an edge-of-city or indeed an inner-city site. This is not an appropriate density in this location, particularly since the site is a gateway to the village. Further, the proposed density would not be in keeping with the pattern of existing housing along the rest of Courthill Road. In addition, from the house known as “The Old School” north-eastwards, the properties on Courthill Road form part of the Rosemarkie Outstanding Conservation Area. As well as being a gateway site to the village, the FR1 site therefore forms part of the setting of the Outstanding Conservation Area and is accordingly an area where such high density of housing is inappropriate. Finally, the FR1 site also borders part of the Fairy Glen Designed Landscape and the high density of housing proposed is also inappropriate on what is part of the setting of a Designed Landscape. Secondly, we further object on the basis that there appears to have been no proper assessment of the feasibility of accommodating the proposed high density of housing development without compromising road safety along Courthill Road. An allocation for this density of housing is accordingly premature. We appreciate that detailed transport assessment and mitigation proposals would be required as part of any masterplan/development brief to be agreed for the site following adoption of the IMFLDP. However, the known deficiencies and constraints affecting Courthill Road, and the feasibility of overcoming these satisfactorily, ought surely to be properly assessed before allocating the FR1 site for such a high number of new homes. If the Authority allocates the site for 50 new homes without first being satisfied that the deficiencies of Courthill Road can be overcome, and if it then turns out that these deficiencies cannot be satisfactorily overcome, there is a genuine risk that sub-standard road solutions will be accepted, and that road safety will be compromised, under pressure to permit the development of 50 new homes to proceed. We consider it imprudent, therefore, that detailed assessment of road arrangements to accommodate 50 new homes should be required only after the site has been allocated for this number of homes. Of particular concern is the junction of Courthill Road with Bridge Street. While there will be land available to improve the junction at the Manse Brae end, there is no scope to improve the dangerously inadequate visibility splay at the junction with Bridge Street. Consequently, arrangements in respect of the proposed 50 new homes would have to be such as to ensure no increase in vehicular use of that junction. We fail to see how this could be achieved. While there is mention in the FR1 "Requirements" section of “road closure for Courthill Road”, the junction at Bridge Street cannot be stopped up unless two-way traffic can safely be accommodated along the length of Courthill Road, from the Gordon Memorial Hall to the junction with Manse Brae/Rosemarkie Road. However, such a two-way system cannot be achieved because of existing pinch points, particularly where the road starts to descend steeply at the house known as “Courthill”. There is no way of widening the road at that point to accommodate two-way traffic as on the one side there is a steep descent into the rear gardens of the houses on the High Street and on the other side sits the high retaining wall forming the boundary of the garden pertaining to “Courthill”. Once a 50 home allocation is adopted in the IMFLDP, the principle that 50 additional homes can be accommodated on the FR1 site will be established, leaving the Authority little room then to resist an application for 50 homes on the site on road safety grounds. We fear there is a genuine risk that inadequate solutions to the road constraints may then be accepted on the basis that the principle of a 50 home development has already been established and agreed in the IMFLDP. We feel that the Courthill Road constraints, and the feasibility of any solutions to them, should therefore be fully assessed before any allocation of

the FR1 site for 50 homes. We note that a solution requires to be found to water pressure issues and, while the installation of a new link water main to service the development is mentioned, there is no mention of whether the feasibility of any such solution has been checked. For reasons similar to those expressed at point 2. above, we feel that the Planning Authority should ensure that feasible solutions to the water pressure issues exist before an allocation of the site for 50 homes is adopted and the principle of a 50 home development on the site thereby established.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	00920	Name	Mr James Grant	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	----------------	--------------	--

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

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	Paragraph 4.59 Fortrose and Rosemarkie
---------	---------------------------	-----------	--

Reference	Site FR1 Rosemarkie	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
-----------	---------------------	------	--------	--------------	----

#### Comment Changes

This area should not be zoned for development. It should remain agricultural land.

#### Representation

The proposal suggests that further development will help sustain “the primary service centre for the Black Isle”. The community centre and the secondary school is already at or overcapacity and needs no further development to sustain it. The IMFLDP states that “all developments must be in keeping with the scale and character of the conservation area”. The HWLDP (para19.6, policy 34 states that proposals should be judged on compatibility with existing. The proposed development is neither of a scale or character that is in keeping with the conservation area or even the adjacent housing. Highland council’s Highland Wide Local Plan ( para4.1) states that growth and development should be directed to places that can support sustainable development. The land zoned for this development is of high agricultural value and should be retained as such. THC’s land use strategy is to ensure that natural assets are protected. MFLDP paras 1.2, 1.5, 2.1 & 2.2). Building on agricultural land is neither sensible or sustainable. This area is part of the Special Landscape Area zoned as such by Highland Council. The development will be contrary to the ethos of the Special Landscape Areas. The housing will impose for traffic loads on the already overloaded high streets of Rosemarkie, Fortrose, Avoch and Munlochy. Where no significant measures have been or can be taken to alleviate the already overburdened narrow town centre streets. ( Refer to HWLDP para 18.8 refers to physical constraints on development). Highland Council states that new development MUST contribute to more efficient forms of travel, (IMFLDP para 2.22 & 20.31.1) Highland Council’s HWLDP states that masterplans should reduce the need to travel. This proposal increases the need for people to travel as most work is located around Inverness or north of the Cromarty Firth. There will be no easy pedestrian access to Rosemarkie High Street – pedestrians will have to walk along Courthill Road – a narrow country lane with narrow verges and no footpaths or along the A832 which has at one section no footpath which is along the busy A832 trunk road. This land is habitat to protected species of farmland birds (skylarks and starlings) (IMFLDP para 21.4) and should not be developed. The HWLDP para 8.2 states that wildlife should be supported. This development will destroy wild life habitat. Highland Council states (para2.25) that they support development if infrastructure, services and facilities required are provided. No infrastructure or facilities are provided by this development; in fact it detracts from existing infrastructure, in particular the already inadequate road system in the area. Highland Council has a policy of creating sustainable communities ( HWLDP para5.1). This development does nothing to maintaining the sustainability of this community. It is a perimeter development, the people living here will be outwith the community.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	00771	Name	Mr Tom Lloyd	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR1 Greenside Farm, Fortrose and Rosemarkie		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Remove FR1 or failing that reduce density of homes on FR9

Representation

Please ignore my submission to you dated the 30 November 2013 as one fact was incorrect. Under the heading Courthill Road in the second sentence "No Vehicle Access" should read "Access only". I now submit the corrected version below I would like considered. I have three main concerns re the FR1 Greenside Farm proposed development and one observation to finish with. 1. Housing Density The are is 1.9 (ha) for fifty houses i.e. 0.038 (ha) per house. This compares with the FR2 proposed development 5.9 (ha) for eighty houses i.e. 0.073 (ha) per house. Nearly twice the density. The Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan adopted in 2007 referring to Rosemarkie Expansion states "Up to 1.7 hectares of land is allocated for 30 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings." The proposed increase in the number of house is totally unacceptable. 2. Courthill Road With the high local Water Table and lack of good drainage Courthill Road suffers from standing water after rainfall. The road is rutted and despite a sign saying "Access only" is used as a "Rat Run" by a number of motorists avoiding the very narrow and busy Rosemarkie High street. No development should commence until all surface water drainage provision, which is SUDS compliant, be completed prior to the first occupaton of any of the houses. 3. Road Junction Any access junction and visibility splays should comply with Council requirements in the interests of road safety. Finally - a number of years ago the then Highland Regional Council had investigated a Rosemarkie by pass and I remember engineers taking core samples in the field behind my house. Any development at Greenside would make any future bypass even more expensive by pushing the line of the road higher up a steep hill. Now is the time for The Council to consider not proceeding with housing on FR1 so as to make any future bypass more economically viable. The Highland Council need to be honest with the inhabitants of Rosemarkie and state one way or the other if for decades of years to come they will be consigned to put up with the high volume of traffic through their village using a most unsuitable main street and the residents on Courthill Road with speeding traffic using it as a bypass.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number	01331	Name	Ms Naomi Lloyd	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Site FR2 Ness gap This site should not have an increase in house numbers over that agreed in the deeply locally resented plan. The increased housing density is not transparent in the plan and has been inserted with no local consultation or agreement. The local infrastructure is inadequate to support it. Then effect on Fortrose High street traffic management is that there is no management, and indeed there is no practical traffic plan that can be implemented. Increasing the housing density will contribute to this problem to the detriment of both locals and tourists. There will be further increase in commuter traffic. The potential primary school site should be retained indefinitely even if there is no immediate requirement is identified. Demographic projections have not been accurate regarding the school rolls in the past and the increased population encouraged by more housing that the local plan and developers wish to bring about in Rosemarkie, Fortrose and Avoch will have a cumulative effect resulting in inadequate school provision sooner or later. The land should not be developed for commercial or retail or housing use but should be retained as agricultural land available as allotments to increase sustainability until there is a requirement for school use. The area has been identified as being a popular tourist destination and of high agricultural value. Neither of these attributes are being served by the increased density proposed for this suburban type developement. Where is the swimming pool site? It is not identifiable on the map.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	01331	Name	Ms Naomi Lloyd	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As per representation.

### Representation

Site FR2 Ness gap This site should not have an increase in house numbers over that agreed in the deeply locally resented plan. The increased housing density is not transparent in the plan and has been inserted with no local consultation or agreement. The local infrastructure is inadequate to support it. Then effect on Fortrose High street traffic management is that there is no management, and indeed there is no practical traffic plan that can be implemented. Increasing the housing density will contribute to this problem to the detriment of both locals and tourists. There will be further increase in commuter traffic. The potential primary school site should be retained indefinitely even if there is no immediate requirement is identified. Demographic projections have not been accurate regarding the school rolls in the past and the increased population encouraged by more housing that the local plan and developers wish to bring about in Rosemarkie, Fortrose and Avoch will have a cumulative effect resulting in inadequate school provision sooner or later. The land should not be developed for commercial or retail or housing use but should be retained as agricultural land available as allotments to increase sustainability until there is a requirement for school use. The area has been identified as being a popular tourist destination and of high agricultural value. Neither of these attributes are being served by the increased density proposed for this suburban type developement. Where is the swimming pool site? It is not identifiable on the map.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	02245	Name	Ronan Lloyd	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As per representation.

### Representation

Site FR2 I am concerned that the primary school site in Fortrose is at risk of being developed for other purposes. I believe this to be an extremely short term policy with no regard for the possible future needs of the community, especialy in view of the excessive new housing. I think this site should revert to agricultural land in the meantime for community use and be retained as a primary school site indefinitely. I do not think there should be an increase in density of the housing over that originally agreed as the increase in traffic congestion is detrimental to the town.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--



Customer Number	00981	Name	Mr Gordon Grant	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Para 4.59 Fortrose & Rosemarkie	
Reference	FR2 Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

The site zoned for a primary school should not be used for commercial development, if it is no longer required for a school.

Representation

Commercial development on this site will detract from the existing town center of Fortrose and adjacent villages. it will increase traffic from adjacent villages to use the development. it will not fit in with adjacent housing - the site is higher that its surroundings. If the land is not used for a School it should revert to agriculture or allotments for the benefit of the community. This should be a condition for allowing the other changes to the Ness Gap Masterplan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	00920	Name	Mr James Grant	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paragraph 4.59 Fortrose and Rosemarkie	
Reference	Site FR2 Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

### Comment Changes

Further restrictions and controls should be imposed on the proposed development

### Representation

This is part of an area described as “the Ness Gap Site” which has been zoned for development under a Master plan under the previous Development Plan for the area. The First development plan prepared for the whole area stated that a maximum of 120 houses (subject to a 10% variation) could be allowed. This recognised the rural nature of the area and the low density of the adjacent housing. It is now proposed that 80 houses in addition to 77 houses that already have been given Planning Permission, a total of 157 houses should be built in this area. The proposed housing density and layout is completely at odds with the existing housing in the area. The houses already constructed look out of keeping with their surroundings. Two storey houses are being constructed against the Council’s policy for this arrea house of a maximum of 11/2 storey s that has been in place for more than 30 years and was stated as a condition in the current Master plan. Increased housing in this area will increase commuting to Inverness, the antithesis of Highland councils “green Policies” and sustainability statements. Highland Council states that new development MUST contribute to more efficient forms of travel (I MFLDP para 2.22 & 20.31.1)Highland Council’s HWLDP states that masterplans should reduce the need to travel. This proposal increases the need for peopleto travel as most work is located around Inverness or north of theCromarty Firth. The proposal states that the development will be constructed in accordance with the Master plan in already in place for the development. In fact the development to date has NOT been constructed in accordance with the Master plan. I am concerned therefore that the following phases will also fail to meet the requirements contained therein. (I append a list of the violations/ post award variations to the Master plan for the area – appendix 1) One of the contentious issues of the proposed development is the increase in traffic through Fortrose High Street. Highland council are taking measures to amend the High Street traffic layout, but the physical constraints of narrow road width (5.1m at the narrowest) combined with narrow pavements (900mm and 1500mm) immediately adjacent means that existing traffic flows already detract from and pose considerable risks to users of the town centre. No matter what modifications are made to the street layout further increases in traffic flow arising from more housing will exacerbate the problem. Further developments to the east of the town will also increase traffic flows and reduce the town centre to a corridor for traffic to access theses expanded communities and destroy the viability and character of the town centre. ( ref para 4.6 of the IMFLDP) The Proposed site is bounded in the East by Ness Road. It should be a condition that housing should be built 4m back from the pavement. Reason: to improve the visual amenity of the area. The Proposed site is bounded on the south side by a traditional right of way (called the salmon fisher’s path). The path is already bounded on one side by housing. New housing should be constructed so that their boundaries are at least 4m from the path. Reason: so that the path does not become a narrow, enclosed, claustrophobic, intimidating rat run. The proposed site is bounded on the west by Easter Greengates, a historic right of way. Conditions should be imposed such that the development does not detract from this right of way. The existing Master plan requires that two play areas be constructed for the development. These areas, in addition to having play equipment for small children should be big enough that children have room to play open games, such as football or chasing games. Reason for the health and well being of residents and the community. The 4th phase of development of this area is underway. At least one of these areas should have been constructed. The proposal suggests that further development will help sustain “the primary service centre for the Black Isle”. The community centre and the secondary school are already at capacity and needs no further expansion of their use. The IMFLDP refers to the Area being attractive for tourists. This suburban development imposed in a rural location detracts from the area and discourages tourism. Appendix 1: violations/ post award changes to the Master plan for Ness Gap (FR2) (2) Phasing: housing was to be constructed in phases B to G. After phase A the next phase constructed was phase G (A small development of 6 high cost houses.) (3) The total number of residential units shall not exceed 100 (added to the first phase this makes a total of 132). 157 houses are now proposed. (5) No more than 10 houses to be built before a traffic management plan is enacted. The houses now built exceed 30. The traffic plan is still not in place. (7iii) In general, a maximum of 11/2 storeys in height or lower where adjacent to existing single storey houses. There are now quite a large proportion of the houses built 2 storeys high. (7ix) Sustainable technologies (the houses are heated by oil fired heating). (11, 12, &13) Restrictions on noise, high pitched reversing alarms, and dust suppression were all ignored. (32) Topsoil is not to be stripped from any area prior to notice of Initiation of Development – the whole site at an early dated was transformed be a large muck shifting operation, (32) No weed control/ grass cutting has been carried out on undeveloped areas. (34) Landscaping of the proposed amenity area shall be carried out on completion of the first phase of the development. Work is now commencing on the third phase.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
Customer Number	00926	Name	Mr Donald John Morrison	Organisation
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)				
Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph		
Reference		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No

#### Comment Changes

Remove Ness Gap Site Area Marked FR2 Proposal for Housing and or Commercial Development. Re-instate Site as proposed on 2007 Local Plan for provision of Primary School Large scale development to the North of the Kessock Bridge should be limited.

#### Representation

The building of a further 80 houses in addition to the ongoing development of 150+ houses would result in what would appear more like a city suburb than a highland village. In addition the infracstructure would simply not cope with this additional volume. There is little evidence of the anticipated improvements promised when the current development at Ness Gap was given permission to build 25% more units than what ad been stated on the local plan. The suggestion that this site may be suitable for a supermarket development beggars belief. The traffic volume on Ness Road with the interst that Chanonry Point provides, the Golf Course, and Caravan and Camping Sites along with the increase that comes as the current development progressess, would suggest that this was an absolute non-starter. I believe this area should be put back on the plan as an area proposed for a Primary School and Playing Field as previously agreed. I can't understand why if some consultation and or assessments are to be undertaken why it was ever removed. As far back as June of this year you have been showing this particular area as an area for housing - as if this is a foregone conclusion. You have very clearly not taken the local residents opinions on board as the conclusion of consultation meeting that took place in Fortrose on 19th June 2013 was unanimous that the proposed Primary School Site should remain and Not be substituted for any other development. I believe large scale development which will put added pressure on traffic volumes using the Kessock Bridge should be limited. As the A96 and A9 South are to receive serious investment over the next 20 or so years I think these areas are/ will be better placed to cope with the subsequent increase in traffic volume that the proposed developments will generate.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

the housing should not exceed the 132 as previously agreed.some plots should be allocated for private designed houses. the site for the primary school must be retained as such and not used for any other especially commerce.

Representation

having knocked on the head the sites up at the wards which was probably because of the required 25% for low cost housing , i know that there is a need for such. initially the housing was no more than 100 which quickly became 100-120 with a 10% addition making it 132. now it seems to be 157.the developer seems to have increased the density in phase 1 which planning should have realised. why did this happen? finally when all these houses are built and children are born , surely there will be a need for a new primary school in the future.if the site is built on where will it go then.we must not be short-sighted.the land on the rosemarkie side of ness road must not be developed.....

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Report states that land "could accommodate 130 new homes" yet we are now told that there will be up to 156. The report in 2010 implied 120 would be the maximum. There is also too low a percentage of affordable to private housing. Also concerned that school site may be lost. There is no need for any more retail adding to the traffic problems already experienced in Fortrose. In the 2010 report it was stated that Tulloch would provide an extra classroom for Fortrose Academy. We now hear that 1st year pupils will be bussed to Alness - is this because the Academy is too small? Yet we are to have more housing and therefore presumably more pupils.

Representation

See above, but reason for change is to reduce the impact - visual, etc of so many houses in such a small area, in a village whose character is going to be lost. Chances are that services will be overloaded leading to frustration and dissatisfaction among existing residents

Allocated to

Customer Number	01042	Name	Ms Lesley Grant	Organisation	Scorrielea Self Catering
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Para 4.59 Fortrose & Rosemarkie	
Reference	FR2 Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

The land zoned for a primary school should be retained for that purpose. If the education dept decide that it is not required for a school the land should not be used for commercial development. It should be returned to agricultural land or used to provide allotments for the local community

#### Representation

This land should not be used for commercial development. It is prime agricultural land and should revert to that if the school is not required. If this is not possible it whould be used to provide allotments for the people in the Ness Gap development or the town whohave such small gardens that they cannot grow there own produce. A commercial development would detract and harm the shops in the existing town center, it would be out of place surrounded by houses. it is on the highest part of the Ness Gap Development and would be extremely obtrusive. A meeting held with the community with this proposal was overwhelmingly rejected by the community.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04293	Name	Pamela Macintyre	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	FR2 Ness Gap		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

No retail units, supermarket or tourism on proposed primary school site

#### Representation

Leave the site for primary school use in future or for agriculture or allotments in short term. Road access inappropriate for retail development.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	00920	Name	Mr James Grant	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paragraph 4.59	
Reference	Site FR2 Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Commercial development or housing should NOT be permitted on this site if the proposal to build a Primary School is withdrawn.

Representation

Part of the site has been zoned for a Primary School. Even although the local population is to be increased, and that the demography of the population is likely to mean that many more young children will live in the area, it is now suggested that a primary school may not be necessary. If this land is not to be used for a Primary School in the short term the land should revert to agriculture in accordance with Scottish Government policy on agricultural land. Alternatively itcould be used to provide allotments for the occupants of the new houses, as the plot size of their houses are so small that their ability to grow their own produce is very limited. The provision of allotments would assist in improving the sustainability of the development. It would provide open space and improve the wellbeing of the community. By holding the land in this form, it would remain a site that could be used for a community development (a primary school or extension to the secondary school that is already at capacity, if this was subsequently found to be necessary. The proposal to use the land for commercial development is not acceptable. Highland Council’s HWLDP para 20.21 States that developments should not have a detrimental affect on the vialbility of village centres. Highland Council held a meeting to discuss this proposal which was overwhelmingly rejected by the large number of attendees. The reasons for rejection of the proposal were and are: It would detract from the existing town centre It would adversely affect existing shops in the town centre It would adversely affect shops in the centre of adjacent villages It would not blend in with the adjacent properties the site is at the highest point of the Ness Gap site. It would increase traffic flows from shoppers from adjacent villages through the existing town centre that already is overcapacity. I am extremely disappointed that Highland Council has allowed this proposal to go forward as it has no merit and it has been made clear that it has no support in the local community.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04406	Name	The Co-operative Group	Organisation	The Co-operative Group
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Graeme Laing		GL Hearn	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. We would like support for retail development at Site FR2 removed and land at Rosemarkie Road allocated as a mixed use development opportunity, with support for retail development.

Representation

1.OBJECTION TO ALLOCATION OF LAND AT NESS GAP (REF: FR2 NESS GAP – 80 HOMES WITH 1.6HA FOR COMMUNITY, BUSINESS, OFFICE, TOURISM OR RETAIL) 1.1The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. 1.2The prospect of the land at Ness Gap being allocated for retail use, first emerged in the Council’s ‘Alternative Sites and Uses’ Consultation Paper (June 2013). Section 6.9 of this consultation paper put forward the allocation of the Ness Gap site for retail development, advising that the Ness Gap site offers the following benefits as a retail development location: •Opportunity for relocated expanded food store (subject to proving no detrimental impact on town centre) •edge of centre location •provides flexibility for future •could improve parking situation in town centre •within easy walking distance of much of Fortrose •close to public transport connections 1.3The Council gave no demonstration at that time that it had considered or applied the sequential approach to site selection as prescribed in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). 1.4The proposed local development plan has taken matters forward and allocates land at Ness Gap (Ref FR2) for a mixed use development, with support for 80 homes and 1.6ha for community, business, office, tourism or retail use. 1.5In the first instance, it should be noted that our client is supportive of the Council’s acknowledgement, as expressed in the alternative sites consultation paper, that there would be benefit in providing for a relocated and expanded foodstore in Fortrose. This of course is the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op foodstore in Fortrose. 1.6However, our client does not consider that the land at Ness Gap is the most appropriate location for a relocated Co-op foodstore and they wish to object to the proposed allocation for the reasons set out below. 1.7The supporting text for draft allocation FR2 establishes that development of the Ness Gap site is to be in accordance with the 09/00471/OUTRC outline planning permission. This application was approved on 8th June 2010 and granted consent for “Masterplan for the erection of houses, formation of access and parking and provision of amenity/open space (Outline)” 1.8We are not aware of this outline permission establishing any support for retail development on the Ness Gap site and there is a disconnect between the uses referred to in proposed allocation FR2 and the requirement for the site to be developed in accordance with the outline planning permission. 1.9The FR2 requirements in the proposed plan also advise that retail development would be required to satisfy the sequential approach to site selection and be the subject of retail impact analysis. 1.10Based on these requirements it appears that the Council have offered support for retail development on the Ness Gap site, without knowing if there are sequentially preferable sites available in Fortrose or if retail development can be accommodated on that site without there being unacceptable impacts on nearby town centres. 1.11Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (paragraph 15) requires that development plans should be aspirational but also realistic and that local development plans should be clear about the scale of anticipated change, demonstrating the underlying reasons for the preferred locations for development. It is evident from the proposed development plan that this established approach to allocating land for development has not been followed by the Council in supporting retail development on site FR2. 1.12In terms of retail development, SPP (paragraph 56) requires that the development plan should enable gaps and deficiencies in provision of shopping, leisure and other services to be remedied by identifying appropriate locations for new development and regeneration. SPP adds that commercial realities should be taken into account when development plans are prepared and that planning authorities should be responsive to the needs of town centre uses, identifying suitable and viable sites in terms of size, location and availability within a reasonable time period, indicating how and when constraints could be resolved. 1.13In allocating the land at Ness Gap for retail development, the Council have had no regard to commercial realities and nor have they considered whether retail development at this location would be suitable or viable. This is particularly important when the rationale of the proposed allocation is to provide for a relocated and expanded Co-op store. 1.14Having applied the sequential approach and considered the alternatives in Fortrose, The Co-operative Group does not consider the Ness Gap site to be suitable from a commercial perspective. Firstly, the site is poorly located as it is physically and functionally detached from Fortrose town centre. Secondly, the Ness Gap site has no visibility which is an absolute commercial requirement for any retail site. Thirdly, a new retail store at Ness Gap would have to be developed amongst an emerging residential development, creating conflict with existing residents and requiring a proposed store to have restricted opening hours and servicing arrangements. It is our client’s experience that introducing a foodstore onto the Ness Gap site would compromise the ability of that site to deliver

a high standard of residential amenity for the housing. 1.15These are all important commercial and operating factors and the commercial deficiencies of the Ness Gap site are such that Co-operative Group would have no interest in it. Therefore, the proposed allocation fails to comply with SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither suitable nor viable as a location for retail development. 1.16Paragraph 62 of SPP also requires that the sequential approach should be used when selecting locations for all retail and commercial leisure uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. It is evident from the list of requirements associated with draft allocation FR2 that the Council have had no regard to the sequential approach as required by SPP. 1.17SPP (paragraph 62) requires that locations for retail development are considered in the following order: •town centre, •edge of town centre, •other commercial centres identified in the development plan, •out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.18We do not agree with the Council’s comments in the alternative sites consultation paper that the Ness Gap site is edge of centre. As the Council acknowledge, the Ness Gap site is at least 480 metres from the edge of the defined town centre, lying outwith the 400 metre walking distance benchmark for encouraging active travel. We therefore consider that the Ness Gap site is out of centre rather than edge of centre. Furthermore, The Ness Gap site is not accessible by a choice of transport modes and lies some 310 metres from the nearest bus stop. 1.19In terms of there being sequentially preferable sites to the land at Ness Gap, this is given coverage in the retail study which has been prepared in support of our client’s proposals for Fortrose. This study demonstrates that there is a sequentially preferable alternative site at Rosemarkie Road which is much closer to the defined town centre and is highly accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.20The Rosemarkie Road site is located approximately 190 metres from the defined town centre, significantly closer than the Ness Gap site. This site offers the opportunity to develop a new foodstore at the junction of Rosemarkie Road and Ness Road, the closest point to the town centre, ensuring that new retail development at this location would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and providing the profile and visibility required by the Co-op. 1.21There are no sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre which are suitable and available for a relocated and expanded Co-op store and the land at Rosemarkie Road has the ability to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned expansion area which lies in close proximity to the town centre. The land at Rosemarkie Road also addresses commercial realities and is a suitable, available and viable site that is well positioned to maximise spin off benefits for Fortrose town centre. 1.22Taking the above matters into account, it is evident that the proposed FR2 Ness Gap allocation runs contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy as there is a sequentially preferable development site available at Rosemarkie Road. Moreover, the draft FR2 allocation is also contrary to SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither suitable nor viable as a location for retail development and it is evident that the Council have had no regard to the commercial realities of developing this site for retail use. 1.23In the course of the development plan process there have been two letters of representation lodged on behalf of the Co-op (and a third letter - Erratum) that set out the operational need for a new Co-op store in Fortrose; that this was a priority for the company moving forward; that the Ness Gap site was unsuitable for operational and policy reasons, and that a favoured site was located adjacent to Rosemarkie Road/Ness Road. 1.24It is disappointing therefore that our client’s requirements have not been supported in the proposed local development plan and that the site discouraged is identified for retail use, even though by dint of the Council’s policy it is not available; and that the site our clients sought, which is proven by application of the sequential approach and the attached retail study to be the most favourable option, is not included, when there appears no reasonable justification not to have done so.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--



Customer Number	01129	Name	Mrs Ann Forbes	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR2	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

#### Comment Changes

Change housing capacity

#### Representation

Page 82 - Mixed Use - Site FR2 NESS GAP. - a) You state a figure of 80 homes with development "in accordance with 09/0047/OUTRC". I object to this statement because it is actually 156 (as per the e-mail from your dept. to me) and consequently anyone looking at the Proposed Plan could not possible know what the true situation is. The figure of 156 is an increase of 24 houses over and above the outline planning 09/00471/OUTRC for 132 houses (Originally it was applied for at 100 - 120 houses to which 323 people objected.) b) I object to more houses putting even more pressure on local services eg. Fortrose Academy not admitting any more 1st years. c) As per the aforementioned e-mail, "This type of housing density is considered medium and appropriate for this site". I object to this statement because I don't think it is appropriate to THIS site.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04322	Name	Rachel McBride	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

#### Comment Changes

I would like to change the proposed identification of land for 130 new homes.

#### Representation

The population has increased greatly in recent years and the results of this are congested roads, parking issues, dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. My husband and I have both nearly been hit by cars in Fortrose High St in the last year, due to the difficult, cramped driving conditions and the lack of provision for cyclists. I am concerned that 130 new homes will create unmanageable levels of traffic and result in accidents for drivers, cyclist and pedestrians. There needs to be more consideration of and provision for cycling in the plan. The number of new houses should be less, in my opinion, because of the problems of increased traffic as already mentioned, but also because this scale of development will contribute to loss of character, with the dominant housing in the villages being modern and repetitive rather than historic/vernacular - the character of the area, which is what draws so many people to visit, is in danger of being lost forever. The fields area of the Ness is important for the beautiful open views to the sea and across the firth, and the spread of housing to fill these gaps changes the character and visual beauty of the settlement. I urge planners to reduce the number of proposed houses.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

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	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

This objection is to the omission of the allocation of land south and east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose for mixed use including retail, business/community and tourist use. Add “Mixed Use Site: south/east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose Area 1.8 ha. Uses: Retail, Business/Community and Tourism Requirements: Masterplan” Proposals Map adjusted accordingly, as attached

Representation

The MIR identifies the site as mixed use non-preferred. The Proposed Plan should allocate the land for mixed uses ie. commercial, tourist and community uses for the following reasons.

Principles

Location

1. The site is limited to 1.8 ha. It is a small self contained discrete landholding that is not part of an agricultural unit or important to the viability of one. It presents no apparent physical or heritage constraints, is serviceable by existing infrastructure and outwith the Area of Great Landscape Value. The site lies within a building line consistent with existing development and infrastructure, and the allocations in the development plan for expansion of Fortrose.
2. The site is located at the east entry point to Fortrose. It sits well with the structure and shape of the village and with infrastructure and service networks. It is extremely accessible, positioned - in the context of the village - on the axis of two important routes, High Street and Ness Road and within comfortable walk-able distance of Fortrose (well within 400m to most of the community) and to Rosemarkie.
3. That position and accessibility gives a strong association and potential for interaction with local shops/businesses on the Main Street and leisure/recreation and heritage attractions located towards the waterfront, in particular the heritage interest of the inner Moray Firth. The site is therefore ideally placed - and there is no alternative location that is comparable - for the development of important community, business and tourism facilities.

Uses

4. Substantial local benefits will arise from the development of a mixed-use proposal incorporating a “package” of commercial, community and visitor facilities. A new village scale supermarket will offer scope to relocate the existing store, increase the capacity for local shopping, improve parking and servicing and help decongest the High Street enabling public safety improvements. An integrated car park will serve all uses, providing additional capacity close to the Main Street.
5. Further small shops, business/office units will be continue to help regenerate Fortrose as new local needs arise; offer potential for new community facilities or the option to relocate existing local services.
6. A visitor centre would enhance the Black Isle as a prestigious heritage resource (themed on the dolphin/Inner Moray Firth interest) and based on a state-of-the-art interpretive

information/education centre, enabling efficient management of seasonal congestion pressures - particularly in the Ness area and possibly incorporating a local park-n'-ride initiative - and an enhanced visitor experience.

7. The “package” will improve local prosperity, employment and the role and function of Fortrose as a service and tourist centre; and will respond positively to a strategic heritage opportunity with spin-off benefits to the local economy. The site is well located to the A832 - the main Black Isle distributor - and sufficiently close to the High Street to complement and strengthen the local business base.

8. The proposed commercial and community elements (retail, small shops/offices, businesses) will provide greater choice of work and amenities within walking distance. A greater capacity for local services would encourage greater patronage by local people and is more likely to improve (healthy) travel patterns.

#### Proposal

9. The proposal has three components: a convenience store to create a 6,000 sq ft shop, a suite of small commercial/business units (also 6,000 sq ft) and a visitor centre. The scale of buildings will be appropriate to the village; it will provide significant new parking also close enough to the High Street to contribute to relieving congestion. The following points support the proposal.

1. The existing store is too small, under-shopped and causes congestion on Main Street through parking and servicing. As a result spending locally is constrained and there is an opportunity to benefit other local businesses by discouraging shopping trips to Inverness (and the traffic implications for the village that associate with that pattern of custom). The proposal would double the size of the store, would carry a larger range of products and offer a service better related to the size of the catchment.

2. There is a lack of provision for economic development and jobs. This site presents an opportunity for economic development and local services for a compatible mix of uses. It could provide for local offices, businesses, health care or social facilities. These are all valuable components of a growing, sustainable service centre.

3. Fortrose is one of the primary Dolphin watching locations in the UK presently estimated to attract some 140,000 visitors per annum. Existing interpretive facilities are rudimentary; there are conflicts with visitors passing through the golf course. The opportunity exists to create a state-of-the-art visitor centre at an internationally important site, manage visitor pressures and enhance enjoyment of the heritage. That part of the local economy is directly related to its heritage.

10. The proposal responds to existing deficiencies and opportunities to enhance the role of Fortrose as a local service and tourist centre and create additional local jobs. It sits extremely well in that regard with the HwLDP priorities for sustainable communities namely, enhanced services, local jobs, support for the economy, promoting tourism and holding visitors, and managing the heritage.

#### Compatibility

11. Careful consideration of the following factors and the MIR “significant cons”, would further confirm the case for allocation of the land as proposed.

1. it does not create any precedent for further development between Rosemarkie and Fortrose. The site is self contained by ownership, it could be designed to create a “stop” to the village, it does not facilitate further development east of Fortrose in any sense. The extent to which that requires to be discouraged is a matter for policy, the plan led system

and the Council's response to representations. The proposal is specifically for economic development/community uses. It creates no precedent for housing or any other development. The line of building that marks the extent of development east of Fortrose (in principal views north from the Chanonry direction) indicates - in visual and landscape impact terms - that the site would "read" with the village edge, that it would not breach the building line that marks the extent of Fortrose to the east and that it would not impose on the open character of that land towards Fortrose, nor the potential indicated in the existing local plan for recreational use of that land.

2. it would not adversely affect prime land. Scottish Planning Policy 2010 indicates that development of prime land is not discouraged as part of the settlement strategy. The site is not part of an existing farm unit. The locational prerequisites for retail and leisure development, the priority to be given to sustaining the role of Fortrose as a sustainable key centre and the very limited encroachment into that land are strong reasons to allow essential economic and community uses.

3. it would not have an adverse impact on existing shops. At the scale proposed a new convenience store could not support specialist butcher and bakery outlets. It would complement existing businesses and be sufficiently close to the High Street to encourage interaction. The same concerns were raised in Fortrose when the existing co-op opened. That retained custom within the village and has contributed to sustaining the present range of shops and businesses. The experience of Fortrose is that a sustainable convenience store is part of sustaining the Main Street. The development of a visitor centre may be an opportunity for local business investment.

4. it need not exacerbate traffic problems: it may improve local traffic circumstances. Any relocation of an existing store will relieve congestion and need not - at the scale proposed - create any significant increase in traffic. This would reasonably be the case also with any new local business accommodation to be created. The proposal may provide an alternative to Inverness to other Black Isle communities and reduce journeys through Fortrose to Inverness. It is within active travel distance of the local resident population. The heritage attractions of the Inner Moray Firth are understood to presently attract 140,000 visitors per annum to Fortrose and that is projected to increase whether or not a visitor centre is established. Related traffic is therefore already generated, irrespective of any proposal to develop a visitor centre. The impact of the proposal in traffic terms should not be overstated; it may essentially be neutral. Any proposal will require to demonstrate by Transport Assessment that the scale of any development is able to be serviced adequately in relation to the functioning of the village and its road network, including any mitigations that might be required, taking into account changes in customer behaviour and choice in transport modes. The capability of the transport network and the effects of the proposal on the village is not a policy matter; but for critical assessment and consideration of evidence by Transport Assessment. That would be a prerequisite of any planning application.

#### Consultation

12. The proponents of the proposal have carried out a non-statutory public engagement with local people to explain the proposal (May 2012). This is estimated to have been attended by more than 150 people; 150 questionnaire/comments leaflets were taken away, 26 were returned. In broad terms these represent a balance of support and opposing views. It is intended to continue to work closely with the community in developing the proposal.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
Customer Number	04322	Name	Rachel McBride	Organisation
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)				
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59
Reference			Type	Change
			Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Change the option for allowing Ness Road gapsite currently earmarked for Primary School to be made available for retail use if school does not go ahead.

#### Representation

My children attend Avoch Primary. It would serve the growing population moving into Fortrose and Rosemarkie's new housing developments, many of whom are young families. I urge planners to retain this proposed siy and, although they would not benefit from a new primary school in Fortrose (as they would be too old), I would be very unhappy for the allocated site for a potential primary school in Fortrose to be made available for other uses such as retail development.I feel a primary school is far more important than more retail developments which would only add to already congested High Street. For families in Fortrose and Rosemarkie, a new school would allow children to walk or cycle to school more easily and safely. Traffic would thereby reduce. A modern school building could improve learning and teaching, as well as run more economically and ecologicalte for future primary school, and not allow it to be made available for retail or other use. Many people work and shop in Inverness, therefore there is little need for further supermarket/retail development in Fortrose.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

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	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

#### Comment Changes

This objection is to the omission of the allocation of land south and east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose for mixed use including retail, business/community and tourist use. Add “Mixed Use Site: south/east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose Area 1.8 ha. Uses: Retail, Business/Community and Tourism Requirements: Masterplan” Proposals Map adjusted accordingly, as attached

#### Representation

This objection is to the omission of the allocation of land south and east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose for mixed use including retail, business/community and tourist use. Location/Site 1.The site extends to 1.8 ha. It comprises a small self-contained landholding ie. the first field only east of Ness Road, it is not prime land, not an agricultural unit and not attached to any other land in the same ownership. The site is outwith the Conservation Area and Special Landscape Area with no apparent physical or heritage constraints, it sits well with the structure and shape of the “town” and with existing infrastructure including Ness Road. The precedent of development east of Ness Road is established. 2.The site is located at the intersection of the A832/Ness Road at the entry point to Fortrose; it therefore associates - and enjoys inter-visibility - with, the High Street and shops and businesses located there; and with the Inner Moray Firth one of the Highlands primary wildlife attractions. It is highly accessible, at the axis of two important routes and within comfortable walking distance, well within 400m of most of the community. The A832 is the main Black Isle distributor; Ness Road links established leisure/recreational facilities - golf, caravan/camping, wildlife viewing - out towards Chanonry Point, an important amenity. 3.The site - by its location, form and orientation - is therefore a natural and logical position in which to locate uses that - for policy, functional or viability reasons – depend on strength of association with strategic transport routes, the established commercial thoroughfare of the “town” and the areas natural heritage. These are both the purpose and prerequisites of the proposal; they are the factors that underpin the right placement of development and demonstrate a “sense of place”. They are the underpinnings moreover, of sustainable development. 4.Fortrose is the Black Isle’s primary service, employment and tourist centre, given status by the PLDP as the areas only “town”. There is no other location in Fortrose or in the Black Isle that offers anything like comparable locational advantage or in any other respect is better suited to the retail, business-community and visitor uses proposed - whether individually or in any configuration/combination. The proposal would serve the local economy, local employment and local service needs. It is the right location for those activities in a strategic and site planning sense. Proposal 5.The proposal comprises: a convenience store (6,000 sq. ft./570m²) as an essential replacement of the existing Co-op store; small retail/business/community units, and a visitor centre; parking for approximately 100 cars and 4 coaches/mini-buses; service access from the A832 and public/customer access from Ness Road. 6.That composition is agreed in principle with the Council (TECS) for its layout, composition and capacity, notwithstanding Transport Assessment. The configuration of the site lends naturally to positioning a convenience store to the north, business-community use in the centre and visitor facilities towards the south. The proposal derives from the following: 7.The existing co-op store is too small, extremely busy and limited by its size in the service it is able to provide. Spending locally is constrained; other businesses could benefit by discouraging trips to Inverness, holding local custom and lessening through-traffic. The proposal would double the size of the store and offer a service better related to the size of the catchment. The Co-op wish to extend, relocate and continue to operate from Fortrose. 8.There is a lack of provision - in a forward plan (PLDP) - for reconfiguring/expanding the “town’s” business and service base, and thus local jobs and economic investment. As part of a compatible mix of uses, potential exists for local offices, a craft business, a further shop, health-care/surgery or social facilities. Some existing services operate from restricted premises, others might establish if land/accommodation were available; these are all valuable services in a growing, sustainable service centre. 9.Fortrose is a honey-pot of visitor activity, one of the UK’s pre-eminent dolphin-watching locations. This is estimated to draw some 140,000 visitors per annum to the Inner Moray Firth. Interpretive facilities are rudimentary. A state-of-the-art visitor centre would contribute to the regional economy, tap into one of its most intrinsic assets and interpret the heritage, consistent with the ethos of the national conservation agencies. It could help manage local conflict with established leisure activities. 10.The proposal responds to existing deficiencies and potential to enhance the role of Fortrose, would create jobs, bolster the economy, hold custom, enhance services and manage the heritage. Those are the hallmarks of sustainability, but they are only attainable if the development plan makes the right allocation of land, for the right uses in the right place. Public Response 11.A masterplan has been in preparation since May 2012. Non-statutory public engagement (exhibition/drop-in session) sought the involvement of local people at the outset. More than 150 people attended, 150 questionnaire/comments leaflets were taken away and 26 were returned, filled-in. Given subsequent pro-forma/petition-type responses to the MIR, the proponents are entitled to place that in perspective. 12.In view of the Schedule 4 and MIR responses,

this objection responds to the following. Fortrose Gap Allocation 13.Fundamentally, the planning authority has not grasped the potential for a mixed-use development of economic activities nor the economies of scale and community benefits that would derive from promoting such uses at one location. It does not (FR2) actually identify land at all - but leaves open to educational review - a faint possibility of either business, office, tourism or retail (accompanying housing) if land was to become available ie., one but not a wider combination of the type of economic development activities promoted at the objection site. 14.Notwithstanding that, in view of the urgency of the existing national convenience store operator for a new site for expansion of a vital public service, that is a completely unacceptable response and no way whatsoever, to forward plan, let alone in a 5-year timescale. In any event, responses to the MIR would indicate that there is no support for a convenience store at “Ness Gap”. The fact is, for land (FR2) to be allocated for that purpose, it should be available; and it is not available. 15.Notwithstanding, Ness Gap is not favoured because of its proximity to existing and future residential occupiers; the potential for conflict from hours of operation, servicing and customer traffic, noise and other behavioural nuisance; and if development were to combine mixed community/business/visitor uses, public safety risk from bringing extraneous traffic, coaches and shuttle services within a residential area. Sequential Approach 16.The Co-op has lodged representations that indicate the Ness Gap allocation would not meet its expectations for expansion; and that the objection site would be a suitable site. The objection site is closer to the centre by more than two thirds distance; it is linked directly, would better offer additional parking capacity, is closer to public transport, would meet operational and viability prerequisites, and would satisfy national policy. That is the essence of the declared interest by the Co-op. No other location in Fortose is better placed to the High Street/centre than the objection site. The planning authority ought to have acknowledged that in the interests of national policy and sustainable development. 17.As national policy the sequential approach should inform the PLDP. The Ness Gap allocation is not as the planning authority claim (MIR) “edge of centre” since it does not adjoin the centre, nor is it inter-visible with the centre, or offer any functional or visual link with the centre; it is comparatively remote from the centre. If the nearest commercial building is taken to be the centre, it is 510m and 590m distant by the two shortest routes; whereas the objection site is 225m; or put differently, the Ness Gap allocation exceeds the straight line walking distance (400m) benchmark for encouraging “active travel”. 18.As regards proximity to public transport, the Ness Gap allocation is 310m from a bus stop, whereas the objection site is 100m from two. In any reasonable judgement the Ness Gap allocation would fall behind the objection site in the “sequential approach”, but the objection site at a strategic and as a pivotal location, is far better suited - for any and all of the above reasons - to a wider range of compatible mixed uses. 19.It is established unequivocally by the response of the operator that there is spare capacity for retailing. Whatever concern the planning authority might have for viability and vitality, its response is to identify a site (FR2) that is further from the centre, unavailable and doubtful of being so, conflicting with residential amenity and that the public does not favour. That response is obstructing not facilitating of sustainable economic development. Land Excambion 20.Any development of the George V playing field would (1) remove an established amenity that is part of the history of Fortrose and its status as a Royal Burgh; and (2) not be compliant with the policy 75 of the Highland wide Local Development Plan (and the principles of the Green Network Supplementary Guidance) which seeks first and foremost to safeguard established open spaces. In a community that is moved by the value it places on open land, the planning authority’s proposition is fanciful. 21.As regards the sequential approach, development of George V playing field would bring a convenience store no closer to the High Street, it would not be inter-visible with the High Street, it would be less visible from the A832; and each of these factors would make development less marketable and thus less viable; but in addition, it would bring relatively intensive uses closer to conflict with residential amenity. Notwithstanding these factors, there can be no reasonable expectation that a convenience store could underwrite the costs of relocating a playing field (with its parking and drainage infrastructure), but in any event the objection site would be too narrow to provide a comparable full-size pitch with reasonable surroundings. Coalescence 22.The objection site presents no risk to coalescence of Fortrose-Rosemarkie and would not confuse their identities. If the site were developed the distance to Rosemarkie would be 440m; and at present it is 375m in (other) places. That is not coalescence but the “clear visual and physical break” or “strategic gap” the PLDP seeks. Furthermore, it would not breach the line of building (north to south) that defines the existing limits of Fortrose to the east. Development of the site would bring the communities no closer than they presently are. Traffic 23.The objection site need not exacerbate traffic problems: it may improve local circumstances. Neither the relocation of the Co-op or new local business need create any significant increase in traffic. The proposal may provide an alternative to Inverness to other Black Isle communities and reduce journeys through Fortrose to Inverness. The visitor attractions generate significant traffic already, and it would not be unreasonable that numbers would increase whether or not a visitor centre is established. The impact of the proposal in traffic terms should not be overstated; that would be indicated in the Transport Statement by Waterman T&DLtd attached. Any proposal will require to demonstrate that the scale of development is consistent with the capacity of the road network and safety. This is for evidence by Transport Assessment and a prerequisite of any planning application. Conclusion 24.The objection site is a strategic, pivotal position for high profile uses dependent on a connection with the commercial axis, the Firth and the wider community; discrete from significant amenity conflicts. It would strengthen the local economy, services and visitor infrastructure; be first in the “sequential approach”, substantially better placed than FR2; and comply with SPP2010 and sustainable development, by efficient use of infrastructure, notably Ness Road. There would be no breach of the building line or coalescence. The PLDP fails to deliver land to meet an immediate essential convenience store. The objection site (1.8 ha.) should, for overwhelming reasons, be allocated for retail, business/community and tourism uses.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04292	Name	David & Pamela Macintyre	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	FR2 Ness Gap		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

Retain the site for a Primary School.

Representation

The Sustainable School Review is unlikely to predict for the long term and may not sanction a primary school in the shorter term. A primary school in Fortrose is more likely to attract young families to Fortrose and Rosemarkie, important to balance the population which is currently weighted towards the elderly. Potential incoming young families will see a local primary school as an essential requirement. For example, despite the recently built new Inshes Primary School in Inverness, a further new school has had to be built at Milton of Leys, only a mile or two away. Incomers could perceive having to bus very young children to Avoch both as a disadvantage and a danger. We would like to see the site used for agriculture or allotments until such time as the primary school is built.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--



Customer Number	04406	Name	The Co-operative Group	Organisation	The Co-operative Group
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Graeme Laing		GL Hearn	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. We wish to see the support for retail development at FR2 removed.

Representation

The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. 1.2 The prospect of the land at Ness Gap being allocated for retail use, first emerged in the Council’s ‘Alternative Sites and Uses’ Consultation Paper (June 2013). Section 6.9 of this consultation paper put forward the allocation of the Ness Gap site for retail development, advising that the Ness Gap site offers the following benefits as a retail development location: • Opportunity for relocated expanded food store (subject to proving no detrimental impact on town centre) • edge of centre location • provides flexibility for future • could improve parking situation in town centre • within easy walking distance of much of Fortrose • close to public transport connections 1.3 The Council gave no demonstration at that time that it had considered or applied the sequential approach to site selection as prescribed in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). 1.4 The proposed local development plan has taken matters forward and allocates land at Ness Gap (Ref FR2) for a mixed use development, with support for 80 homes and 1.6ha for community, business, office, tourism or retail use. 1.5 In the first instance, it should be noted that our client is supportive of the Council’s acknowledgement, as expressed in the alternative sites consultation paper, that there would be benefit in providing for a relocated and expanded foodstore in Fortrose. This of course is the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op foodstore in Fortrose. 1.6 However, our client does not consider that the land at Ness Gap is the most appropriate location for a relocated Co-op foodstore and they wish to object to the proposed allocation for the reasons set out below. 1.7 The supporting text for draft allocation FR2 establishes that development of the Ness Gap site is to be in accordance with the 09/00471/OUTRC outline planning permission. This application was approved on 8th June 2010 and granted consent for “Masterplan for the erection of houses, formation of access and parking and provision of amenity/open space (Outline)” 1.8 We are not aware of this outline permission establishing any support for retail development on the Ness Gap site and there is a disconnect between the uses referred to in proposed allocation FR2 and the requirement for the site to be developed in accordance with the outline planning permission. 1.9 The FR2 requirements in the proposed plan also advise that retail development would be required to satisfy the sequential approach to site selection and be the subject of retail impact analysis. 1.10 Based on these requirements it appears that the Council have offered support for retail development on the Ness Gap site, without knowing if there are sequentially preferable sites available in Fortrose or if retail development can be accommodated on that site without there being unacceptable impacts on nearby town centres. 1.11 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (paragraph 15) requires that development plans should be aspirational but also realistic and that local development plans should be clear about the scale of anticipated change, demonstrating the underlying reasons for the preferred locations for development. It is evident from the proposed development plan that this established approach to allocating land for development has not been followed by the Council in supporting retail development on site FR2. 1.12 In terms of retail development, SPP (paragraph 56) requires that the development plan should enable gaps and deficiencies in provision of shopping, leisure and other services to be remedied by identifying appropriate locations for new development and regeneration. SPP adds that commercial realities should be taken into account when development plans are prepared and that planning authorities should be responsive to the needs of town centre uses, identifying suitable and viable sites in terms of size, location and availability within a reasonable time period, indicating how and when constraints could be resolved. 1.13 In allocating the land at Ness Gap for retail development, the Council have had no regard to commercial realities and nor have they considered whether retail development at this location would be suitable or viable. This is particularly important when the rationale of the proposed allocation is to provide for a relocated and expanded Co-op store. 1.14 Having applied the sequential approach and considered the alternatives in Fortrose, The Co-operative Group does not consider the Ness Gap site to be suitable from a commercial perspective. Firstly, the site is poorly located as it is physically and functionally detached from Fortrose town centre. Secondly, the Ness Gap site has no visibility which is an absolute commercial requirement for any retail site. Thirdly, a new retail store at Ness Gap would have to be developed amongst an emerging residential development, creating conflict with existing residents and requiring a proposed store to have restricted opening hours and servicing arrangements. It is our client’s experience that introducing a foodstore onto the Ness Gap site would compromise the ability of that site to deliver a high standard of residential amenity for the housing. 1.15 These are all important commercial and operating factors and the commercial deficiencies of the Ness Gap site are such that Co-operative Group would have no interest in it. Therefore, the proposed allocation fails to comply with SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither

suitable nor viable as a location for retail development. 1.16 Paragraph 62 of SPP also requires that the sequential approach should be used when selecting locations for all retail and commercial leisure uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. It is evident from the list of requirements associated with draft allocation FR2 that the Council have had no regard to the sequential approach as required by SPP. 1.17 SPP (paragraph 62) requires that locations for retail development are considered in the following order: • town centre, • edge of town centre, • other commercial centres identified in the development plan, • out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.18 We do not agree with the Council’s comments in the alternative sites consultation paper that the Ness Gap site is edge of centre. As the Council acknowledge, the Ness Gap site is at least 480 metres from the edge of the defined town centre, lying outwith the 400 metre walking distance benchmark for encouraging active travel. We therefore consider that the Ness Gap site is out of centre rather than edge of centre. Furthermore, The Ness Gap site is not accessible by a choice of transport modes and lies some 310 metres from the nearest bus stop. 1.19 In terms of there being sequentially preferable sites to the land at Ness Gap, this is given coverage in the retail study which has been prepared in support of our client’s proposals for Fortrose. This study demonstrates that there is a sequentially preferable alternative site at Rosemarkie Road which is much closer to the defined town centre and is highly accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.20 The Rosemarkie Road site is located approximately 190 metres from the defined town centre, significantly closer than the Ness Gap site. This site offers the opportunity to develop a new foodstore at the junction of Rosemarkie Road and Ness Road, the closest point to the town centre, ensuring that new retail development at this location would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and providing the profile and visibility required by the Co-op. 1.21 There are no sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre which are suitable and available for a relocated and expanded Co-op store and the land at Rosemarkie Road has the ability to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned expansion area which lies in close proximity to the town centre. The land at Rosemarkie Road also addresses commercial realities and is a suitable, available and viable site that is well positioned to maximise spin off benefits for Fortrose town centre. 1.22 Taking the above matters into account, it is evident that the proposed FR2 Ness Gap allocation runs contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy as there is a sequentially preferable development site available at Rosemarkie Road. Moreover, the draft FR2 allocation is also contrary to SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither suitable nor viable as a location for retail development and it is evident that the Council have had no regard to the commercial realities of developing this site for retail use. 1.23 In the course of the development plan process there have been two letters of representation lodged on behalf of the Co-op (and a third letter - Erratum) that set out the operational need for a new Co-op store in Fortrose; that this was a priority for the company moving forward; that the Ness Gap site was unsuitable for operational and policy reasons, and that a favoured site was located adjacent to Rosemarkie Road/Ness Road. 1.24 It is disappointing therefore that our client’s requirements have not been supported in the proposed local development plan and that the site discouraged is identified for retail use, even though by dint of the Council’s policy it is not available; and that the site our clients sought, which is proven by application of the sequential approach and the attached retail study to be the most favourable option, is not included, when there appears no reasonable justification not to have done so.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	01888	Name	Gwyn Phillips	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

No retail or commercial use for the primary school site. Total number of houses in the Ness Gap to be the same as in the last local plan.

Representation

The area proposed for a new primary school should never be considered for retail or commercial use. Such use is against the primary policy of protecting town centres. If it not required for a school there are many other more suitable uses for this site, such as more 1 bedroom social or affordable housing, a daycare facility for senior citizens or a medical facility. Nowhere in the plan have the wishes of the local populace, for this site, been considered. There is an increase in the total number of houses to be built in the Ness Gap from 120, in the last LDP, to over 150 now proposed. The housing density is out of keeping with the area. The developer has been building out the site so that these extra units could be accommodated and therefore appears to expect such approval to be forthcoming.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

Reinsertion of Primary School, Insertion of Swimming Pool, and major problems regarding suitability of the A832 for the development.

#### Representation

Site FR2 Proposed Primary School The Primary School was a major part of the development of FR2 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 Quote: 11. A site of 1.8 ha. shall be safeguarded adjacent to the Deans and Ness Roads for the provision of a primary school with playing field, serving the Fortrose and Rosemarkie area In the new IMFLDP it states “No development of site identified for a primary school on masterplan prior to the Sustainable Schools Estates Review” Surely the site has to be identified prior to the Review and then if the review finds there is no demand for a new school only then should it be removed from the masterplan. Indeed, with all the planned new extra housing and the ageing primary school in Avoch there might well be a demand for a primary school in Fortrose. Site FR2 Black Isle Swimming Pool Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states 10. Land is reserved for expansion of Black Isle Leisure Centre to provide a swimming pool, a project being led by the community. An area of approximately 0.6 ha. is reserved for this purpose and for additional community/leisure facilities to meet local needs. Incredibly, especially to those of us who have campaigned for a new Pool for many years, the swimming pool does not even get a mention in the new plan. Road Infrastructure relating to FR1 and FR2 Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states “The need to reconstruct the dangerous A832 route between Fortrose and Avoch is a major concern.” Many people in Fortrose and Rosemarkie believe that the infrastructure for the proposed developments, particularly the A832 between the Fairy Glen in Rosemarkie and Avoch is totally unsuitable for large scale increased housing, and before any further development is approved something must be done about it. Having attended various meetings organised by the Council to discuss improvements to Fortrose High Street, it has also become clear that any changes made here can only be minor and cosmetic. The very nature of the naming of FR2 - The Ness Gap - is a very suggestive one, implying that there is somehow a "need" to fill this "gap". I am concerned that a lot of development here and on the Black Isle is led by developers and not by community needs.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

If additional housing over the previous plan is approved, all or at least a large proportion of the houses should be affordable.

#### Representation

A reason given by Highland Council for approving the original development was to increase the provision of affordable housing in the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number	02265	Name	Mr Kenny Fraser	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Primary school on this site should be a preferred option over retail development.

Representation

The Council should acknowledge the low level of local support for any retail development on this site and the high level of support for a primary school, as well as considering the outcome of the Sustainable School Estates Review. Many of us find it hard to believe that an additional primary school in this area can be 'surplus to educational needs' if the local demographic is to be diversified.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04239	Name	James Grant	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59 Fortrose & Rosemarkie	
Reference	FR2 Ness Gap		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The Master plan for this development should clearly indicate the provision for, location and extent of land set aside for a swimming pool.

Representation

This was one of the conditions for granting permission for this development. It is essential that this land be retained, near to the existing Community Center. it is important that the development has more than just houses built to try to sustain the wellbeing of the community.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	04223	Name	Calum Anton Dip.Arch.,Dip.TP ret'd	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Para 8 Consultation Document	
Reference	Fortrose/Rosemarkie Ness Gap H1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Outline Consent was granted in June 2012 for 132 house units for this site, being a 25% reduction from 176. There would have been good planning reasons for this reduction in numbers and these were probably listed and reasons and conditions to the consent. It is now proposed to add 80 houses PLUS mixed use development to the site. In considering any increase in this number, have these conditions been addressed? I am not aware of such.

Representation

The Developer has at this time either built, or has detailed consents or applications submitted for his outline consented 132 units while still having approx. 1/3 of the zoned H1 site lying empty. Following the consent of June 2012 for 132 units, did the Council require the developer to submit a revised Masterplan layout to accommodate and affirm the reduced number? Was this done? It is noted that there is a revision note on the consultants drawing 023 showing "indicative outline layout removed" while the road infrastructure only remains. If a layout was required on the original Masterplan, it must surely be a requirement on the revised and consented layout. H1 Development areas A-F, extrapolated and revised to FR2, would indicate that areas A (affordable) B, and C, and approx. 1/3 of D, are either built on, consented, or applied for, for a total of 132 units. This leaves areas E,F and 1/3 of D undeveloped - or in theory, as only 132 are "consented" undevelopable for housing. The Developer is therefore saying "I have got all this ground with outline consent and detailed consent for your 132 units. Are you going to prevent me from developing this "surplus" ground?" But the good reasons and conditions why the original application of 176 units was reduced to 132 are still there, unresolved and unchanged. The final sentence in this para 8 is concerning. You state that the built, consented and applied for, amounts to 132 houses. I would suggest that these should be regarded as all "built". To say that 77 houses have been built is in fact correct at this time, built realistically misleading when the future reality is 132. To now add 80 to this figure, PLUS mixed uses as you are recommending is simply overdevelopment. This amounts to 212 house units, not to mention the mixed use additions. This may well be a possible density but it is appropriate? A quick walk around many recent similar private sector housing developments show a scene of tight packed uninspired monotony. A good and quick comparison of densities can be seen along the site's southern boundary on the 2009 Masterplan. The area lying between Ness Road and Wester Greengate and bounded the outer ends of Greengate Place and Chanonry Crescent contains 36 properties. A simple visual comparison of what 212 properties situated immediately beyond this NW boundary implies, is self evident in terms of inappropriate neighbouring development. Taking an average plot density of 3 per house would result in approx. 640 extra souls to Fortrose. Simply, can it handle it without some serious infrastructure and community improvements, particularly to education and roads/traffic. If the recent tinkering with the High Street is anything to go by then I am not hopeful.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number	00920	Name	Mr James Grant	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Pargraph 4.59 Forrose and Rosemarkie	
Reference	Site FR3 Cemetery extension:		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

The proposal to use land of high agricultural value for a cemetery extension should be rejected

Representation

The land for the proposed cemetery extension is of high agricultural value and should be retained as such. THC’s land use strategy is to ensure that natural assets are protected. MFLDP paras 1.2, 1.5, 2.1 & 2.2). If a cemetery extension is required it could be sited on poorer quality land on the hillside between Fortrose and Rosemarkie or some other site on less fertile ground should be located.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR3	Cemetery extension	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number	04417	Name	Trustees of Mrs E Clouston	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Kerri McGuire		Graham And Sibbald	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Pages 80 - 82 Fortrose and Rosemarkie	
Reference	Main Issues Report Site Reference H3		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

#### Comment Changes

Our client requests that the land at The Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Site Reference H3) is allocated for residential development in the Proposed Plan. We also request that the settlement boundary is amended to include this site and that the settlement boundary remains the same as the boundary in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan.

#### Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client the Trustees of Mrs E Clouston. Our client owns the land at The Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H3) and wishes to strongly object to the removal of the housing allocation for this site. We also wish to object to the alteration of the Fortrose settlement boundary which now places this site outwith the Fortrose settlement. The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan and was identified as a preferred site at the Main Issues Report consultation stage. We request that this site remains allocated for housing in the emerging Local Development Plan. Current Policy Allocation The site at The Wards is currently allocated for residential development comprising 16 units, within the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (adopted February 2007). The Background text for Fortrose in the adopted Local Plan (page 72) details that the town maintains a high level of housing demand, particularly from people who work in Inverness or are retired. Housing predictions set out in page 72 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan details that there is a combined requirement for up to 144 more houses within Fortrose and Rosemarkie by 2011, with a further 96 from 2011 to 2017. We request that this site remains allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Development Plan. The continued allocation of this site ensures that there is an effective supply of housing land within Fortrose. The small scale nature of this site also ensures there is flexibility in the land supply to address the housing requirements for this area. Main Issues Report Allocation The land at The Wards was identified at the Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation stage for the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as a preferred site. The Council recognised at the MIR stage that this site is allocated in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. The Council also identified that the development of this site would ‘round off’ the settlement to the north east. Our client submitted representations to the MIR consultation stage to support the continued allocation of this site. As stated in our previous representations, we were seeking a reduced allocation for 8 dwellings at The Wards. Given the topography of the site we do not consider that 16 units could be accommodated at the site. As stated previously, we supported the allocation of this site and the extent of the site boundary identified at the MIR stage. It is considered that the proposed reduction in units would allow the Council to continue to support the development of this site for residential units. The Highland Council has not provided sufficient justification to the change in position and the exclusion of this site from the Proposed Plan. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled ‘Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.’ In relation to site H3 at Fortrose the Council has stated that the proposed 8 houses is a more suitable capacity for this site and this would help mitigate the visual impact. The Council has outlined that: “However there would still remain a significant landscape and visual sensitivity to this sites development. It would reduce the gap between Rosemarkie and Fortrose and lies in a prominent position on the hillside which means that even with mitigation measures the site would have negative impact on the character of the village.” The Council has provided no justification for the change in the position from the adopted Local Plan and Main Issues Report and why they now consider that the development of this site has ‘significant’ landscape and visual sensitivity. The site is located within the current settlement boundary for Fortrose and the development of this site for small scale low density housing would complement the existing development pattern and existing land uses. The site has been identified for development by The Highland Council for a number of years without any concerns in relation to landscape and visual impact being raised. The Council has cited in their comments that the East Ross Settlement Landscape Capacity Study 2001 discourages development in this location. We have reviewed the Landscape Capacity Study and it identifies the site as an undeveloped site included within the adopted local plan. As the site is zoned for development the landscape constraints are not assessed in this assessment. It is not identified in the Assessment as an area unsuitable for development. The Council’s comments in relation to this site also state that the local road network is problematic and there is no footpath provision. Again, we would reiterate that this site has been identified for development for a number of years and that this is an issue relevant for any future development at Fortrose. This is addressed in the Proposed Plan (paragraph 4.62) which details that: “There is also a need to consider the implications of future development on the local road network and if necessary secure appropriate mitigation.” This site has been identified for development for a number of years and the concerns raised by the Council at the Proposed Plan stage have not been previously identified as preventing development at this site. We



consider that the concerns raised by the Council in relation to landscape and visual impacts can be addressed through mitigation and at the detailed planning application stage. The Council’s concerns in relation to the local road network are not specifically related to this site and as identified by the Council in the Proposed Plan this can be addressed by securing appropriate mitigation. We therefore request that the Council continues to allocate this site for residential development and that the settlement boundary remains as existing in the adopted Local Plan.

**Planning Justification for the Continued Allocation of Site** The Highland Council has identified concerns that this site is not an effective housing site as it has appeared in successive Local Plans without securing planning permission to enable its development. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Supply outlines the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a site. Paragraph 55 of this PAN sets out the criteria as follows: “Ownership: the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. Where a site is in the ownership of a local authority or other public body, it should be included only where it is part of a programme of land disposal; Physical: the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development. Where there is a solid commitment to removing the constraints in time to allow development in the period under consideration, or the market is strong enough to fund the remedial work required, the site should be included in the effective land supply; Contamination: previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site or, if it has, commitments have been made which would allow it to be developed to provide marketable housing; Deficit Funding: any public funding required to make residential development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned; Marketability: the site, or a relevant part of it, can be developed in the period under consideration; Infrastructure: the site is either free of infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and Land use: housing is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms, or if housing is one of a range of possible uses other factors such as ownership and marketability point to housing being a realistic option.” Assessing each of the above criteria in turn, we consider that this site remains an effective residential site and should remain allocated in the Local Development Plan.

**Ownership** – The site is owned by our client who intends to release the site for residential development.

**Physical** – The site is free from physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed for residential use. The topography of the site has been taken into consideration and we are proposing a reduction in the number of units accommodated at the site.

**Contamination** – the site is currently greenfield and free from any known contamination.

**Deficit Funding** – no public funding is required to deliver this site for housing.

**Marketability** – The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. It is our client’s intention to bring this land forward for development in the short to medium term.

**Infrastructure** – the required infrastructure to service this site can be provided to allow this site to be developed.

**Land Use** – residential use is the most appropriate use for this site. This use would complement the surrounding land uses and there is market demand for housing within Fortrose. We consider that we have demonstrated above that the site remains an effective housing site and should be allocated for residential use in the Local Development Plan. The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted Local Plan and was identified as a preferred site at the Main Issues Report Stage. The concerns raised by the Council at the Proposed Plan stage in terms of landscape and visual impact and access can be mitigated and should not prevent the continued allocation of the site. We therefore request that the Council continues to allocate this site for residential development for 8 units. We also request that the settlement boundary for Fortrose continues to include this site within the boundary.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I am disappointed that it appears the the area for the Black Swimming Pool has been "missed" off the plan or "removed" from the plan. I have had numerous complaints including comment from the Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council as they are a statutory consultee. The planned area for the pool needs to be re-instated and shown on the plan. Councillor Craig Fraser

Representation

I am disappointed that it appears the the area for the Black Swimming Pool has been "missed" off the plan or "removed" from the plan. I have had numerous complaints including comment from the Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council as they are a statutory consultee. The planned area for the pool needs to be re-instated and shown on the plan. Councillor Craig Fraser

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Page 80 at 4.59 - 2nd bullet point. If "Commercial Opportunity" means a supermarket, my objection would be on the grounds that it would have an adverse effect on the local shops in Fortrose and Rosemarkie

Allocated to

Customer Number	04406	Name	The Co-operative Group	Organisation	The Co-operative Group
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Graeme Laing		GL Hearn	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	Land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses.

Representation

REPRESENTATION IN SUPPORT OF THE ALLOCATION OF LAND SOUTH AND EAST OF A862/NESS ROAD, FORTROSE FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING RETAIL, BUSINESS/COMMUNITY AND TOURIST USES. 2.1.As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses. 2.2The Council has acknowledged that there is an opportunity for relocated expanded food store in Fortrose, that being a relocation of the existing Co-op store at High Street. At this point it is worth giving some coverage to the rationale for the proposed Co-op relocation. 2.3The existing Co-op store at High Street extends to 219 sqm (gross) and has been trading for over 12 years. While the High Street store has served our client well, its scale, nature and characteristics no longer best serve the customers who shop at the store. The existing store suffers from a variety of problems which compromise the satisfaction of the customers and the efficient operation of the store, including the following: •Aisles are too narrow resulting in congestion within the store; •General congestion around the checkouts and aisles results in conflict between customers waiting to be served and those manoeuvring through these areas; •The entrance foyer to the store is constricted and does not allow for the full range of customer services to be provided. Congestion also arises in this area; •Checkout provision is insufficient, resulting in frequent and persistent queues; •Congestion within the store makes it difficult to manoeuvre stock trolleys and cages through aisles and shelves to replenish stock. As a result shelves are stacked at higher levels than normally found in foodstores. •The need for stock replenishment during busy times is, in itself, inconvenient for customers as cages take up valuable circulation space; •There is insufficient floorspace to display a sufficient quantity of some goods and insufficient floorspace to offer customers the desired range of goods; •The size and configuration of the storage area is currently inadequate, creating a compromised working environment for warehouse staff; and •Lack of storage space results in increased need for more frequent deliveries which is both environmentally damaging and inefficient from an operational perspective. 2.4The existing Co-op store is exhibiting the above characteristics and these deficiencies cannot be resolved through the reorganisation of the store’s internal layout. It should be noted that the deficiencies of the existing store have given rise to a series of operational difficulties, resulting in the Council having to pursue enforcement proceedings due to the storage of materials outwith the Co-op store. 2.5Today, customers expect convenience stores to provide an attractive and spacious shopping environment allowing them to undertake their shopping trip efficiently and in relative comfort. The existing Co-op store does not allow for this and consequently the Co-operative Group is keen to meet customer expectations and demands in Fortrose. 2.6The Co-op enjoy a reputation for a high level of quality and customer service within their stores but facilities in the existing Fortrose store no longer meet the company’s standards. The Co-operative Group are therefore committed to making a significant investment to provide a new larger foodstore in Fortrose, improving upon the quality of the existing store and improving the overall retail offer in the town. 2.7It is therefore necessary to provide a new Co-op store in Fortrose in the right location in order to provide a shopping facility that provides a more comprehensive range of goods and services, more closely aimed at meeting shopper’s needs and on a site that is highly accessible to the catchment population and well connected to Fortrose town centre. Sequential Approach 2.8Scottish Planning Policy is clear that in allocating land for retail development, the local planning authority must have regard to the sequential approach and allocations must be suitable, viable and take commercial realities into account. 2.9The Co-operative Group consider that the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most suitable location for a relocated and expanded store in Fortrose, offering the opportunity to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned mixed use development, in close proximity to the existing town centre. 2.10The accompanying retail study demonstrates that there are no suitable or available sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre and that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most suitable suite for new retail development in Fortrose. The land at Rosemarkie Road lies only 190 metres from the defined town centre and offers the opportunity to create a development that will be well connected to the town centre. 2.11Secondly, the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most commercially suitable site for new retail development in Fortrose. The Co-op require to maintain a high profile trading position in the town and this is something which the land at Rosemarkie Road would provide, allowing the Co-op to develop a new store that would have strong linkages with

established commercial activities and local businesses. Retail Capacity 2.12Having established that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most favourable site sequentially and commercially, we have given consideration to whether new retail development can be accommodated at Rosemarkie Road without having any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.13Firstly, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the proposed convenience store is not a large supermarket and is of a scale that is designed to improve the existing retail offer of the town but is commensurate with the role and function of Fortrose. At 557 sqm the proposed retail store would fall well below the 2,500 sqm threshold which SPP requires a retail impact assessment to be undertaken. 2.14A retail study has been prepared in support of our clients proposals and this demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op store without there being any impacts on the vitality and viability of Fortrose town centre. 2.15In terms of key findings, the study demonstrates that the resident population within the Fortrose catchment area generate approximately £12.68m of convenience goods expenditure and only £5.30m of this expenditure is captured by existing stores within the Fortrose catchment. 2.16The study indicates that up to £7.38m of the convenience goods expenditure generated by the Fortrose catchment is currently leaking to more distant locations, most probably to Inverness. 2.17The store proposed at Rosemarkie Road would have a company average turnover of approximately £3.08m, with £2.8m drawn from the Fortrose catchment. Of this £2.8m, £1.73m would be diverted from the existing Co-op store in Fortrose and the remaining £1.1m would be drawn from the £7.33m of trade that is currently leaking from the Fortrose catchment. 2.18Given the scale of capacity within the Fortrose catchment area it is evident that there is sufficient expenditure within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support a new store at Rosemarkie Road without there being any negative impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.19The provision of a larger Co-op store in Fortrose will simply help to retain more shoppers within the town, thereby reducing the number of shoppers travelling a longer distance to the large foodstores located outwith the catchment area and clawing back expenditure to the town. 2.20The proposals would not have any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. The other convenience retailers in Fortrose town centre provide specialist bakery and butchery products and are well supported by the local community. A relocated Co-op store would not have an instore bakery or fresh butchery counter and therefore would not compete with these well established businesses that the Co-op already trade alongside. Moreover, with the proposed site being only 190 metres from the town centre, there are likely to be spin off benefits for the town centre by developing a new store in such close proximity to the High Street. Other Relevant Matters 2.21The land at Rosemarkie Road is the most sequentially preferable site in Fortrose for new retail development and a new store of the scale and nature proposed can be accommodated on the site without there being any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.22In terms of other relevant matters, a well-designed development on the site would not only deliver a new planned defensible boundary on the town’s northern edge but would also achieve a more uniform boundary when considered in conjunction with adjacent land uses, thus improving the defensibility of the edge generally. 2.23The Rosemarkie Road site relates more in character to the existing settlement and should be considered more as a suitable site on the edge of the existing settlement than a meaningful component of the countryside. The proposed development would knit into the existing urban fabric and will also allow for the creation of a sensitive, clearly defined and well contained interface with the countryside to the north. Contained development at Rosemarkie would form an appropriate edge to the settlement and would not form urban sprawl or encourage coalescence in any way. 2.24The proposed development will have no significant adverse impacts upon the environment, landscape, heritage resources and nature conservation. Rather, it will have a beneficial impact upon the above through high quality proposals that respect local character, delivering an improved landscape setting. 2.25In overall terms, the proposal complies with national, strategic and local planning policies for retail development. Having regard to the proposal’s ability to deliver additional choice to Fortrose, the absence of any sequentially preferable sites and its compliance with planning policy, it is evident that the proposed store represents a valuable opportunity to meet the needs of Fortrose and is therefore commended to The Highland Council for inclusion within the emerging local development plan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04059	Name	Robbie Kerr	Organisation	Blak Isle Swimming Pool Foundation and Resident
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	Leisure Centre, Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

The swimming pool given planning full permission in May 2009 (Ref. 09/00202/FULRC) and the consent purified in November 2010 by the construction of a section of building with the following plaque, "BLACK ISLE SWIMMING POOL FOUNDATION This plinth built in November 2010 herewith purifies the Planning consent granted by The Highland Council on 29 May 2009 in perpetuity. FUTURE COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOL" should be recognised and zoned in the new local plan. Photo graphic copies of the aforementioned construction and plaque were submitted to the Council Planning Department at the time.

#### Representation

The Black Isle Swimming Pool Foundation has been in existence for many years and has been well received by the community, Sport Scotland and the Highland Council Planning Department in their desire to have a pool built for the local community. It is clear, however, that at this point in time the pool will have to await better economic conditions in which to be realised, in this it shares the same financial constraints as many other housing, community and commercial facilities. Its location next to the existing Leisure Centre is key to its management and use by the community to enable diverse family activities to happen under the one roof. It clearly needs the additional parking specified at planning stage and we would strongly propose that an adequate space continues to be allowed for future community facilities in the same area. We hope also that the currently identified future public footpath to the south east of the swimming pool site leading from Academy Street to Greengates is also part of the land zoned for community use.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04059	Name	Robbie Kerr	Organisation	Blak Isle Swimming Pool Foundation and Resident
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59 / 4.60	
Reference	Housing		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

It would appear that sites available for individual houses have been removed from the Local Plan. Not everyone wants to buy a house built by a developer in a housing estate, in fact, the villages have a history of one-off houses and add a greater sense of diversity to the character of the villages.

#### Representation

I propose that sites for individual and small groups of houses be re-instated in the proposed Local Plan. The housing recently developed at the top end of East Watergate and leading to Wards Farm have now become part of the village structure and I see no reason why this area could not be further reinforced with a small additional number of houses.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00647	Name	Mr Stuart Edmond	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As per representation.

### Representation

Comments on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan 4 Development Allocations Fortrose and Rosemarkie, Pages 80 et seq 1 Para 4.59: The draft correctly identifies the status of Fortrose as the primary service centre for the Black Isle and states that housing expansion proposed will help to sustain this role. But it fails to acknowledge the consequence of this, mainly the additional pressure which will be put on already overstretched main road in village which will be made worse by the traffic calming measures being put in place. 2 It also fails to mention that as a main centre for education, leisure and recreation for the whole 10,000 or so population of the area, the area has not got a swimming pool, the provision of which is desired throughout. The Black Isle community has campaigned for such a facility for more than 60 years. A few years ago it seemed within reach had it not been for Highland Council’s decision not to support it with the modest annual revenue subsidy required. The land and Planning Permission (purified) for a pool exists as does the will to make it a reality given modest Council backing. As some 1000 new houses are planned, the case for a pool is now even stronger. 3 I urge, therefore, that the wording of the fourth indented para. in 4.59 be re-worded specifically to mention a swimming pool as a main possible enhancement. (The wording in the existing plan is an example to follow) In the Action Plan in the relevant place, reference to Highlife Highland should be eliminated or qualified as HH has no funds of its own and simply acts as an agent for the Council. It is for Highland Council to decide policy in regard to provision of leisure and recreation facilities and to make capital available to achieve such provision or to assist others with funding so that they can do so.It would therefore be more accurate to substitute “Highland Council” for “Highlife Highland”. 4 In regard to Para 4.60, the draft again identifies the growth imposed on growth by the desire (the strength of which has never been tested) to maintain a physical separation between the villages. This, if continued with in its entirety, would have prevented the provision of the new water treatment plant, and now is leading to the concentration of housing and commercial development in the centres of the villages, using scarce high- quality agricultural land, and which, aided and abetted by traffic calming in High Street, will cause traffic chaos in Deans Road and at top of Ness Road. 5 As the two settlements are only a short distance apart- were joined for civic purposes some 400 years ago, and are already inextricably linked, sharing education, medical, postal, pharmaceutical and most other services, it seems senseless and counterproductive to maintain what is now a wholly artificial separation. There may well be a case for retaining the southern part of the land to the south-east of the main road, but there is no good reason for this prohibition on the land to the north-west, which in any event already has been developed by the Water Treatment Plant. 6 I therefore urge that the whole of the land to the north-west of the main road between FR3 and the Water Treatment Plant be designated for commercial and light industrial uses, particularly for local servicing businesses. There is no need to preserve land for an extension of the existing fairly new cemetery, which after 30 years or so of use remains less than half full. Such provision is long term and could readily be accommodated on land on higher ground behind the settlements. [redacted]

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01129	Name	Mrs Ann Forbes	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Introduction		Paragraph		
Reference	Settlements / Map 1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

To not identify Fortrose and Rosemarkie as a town
---

Representation

Prior to page 1 under the heading of Settlements- Fortrose and Rosemarkie are designated as a TOWN. My objections are:- a) Not appropriate because of the need to conserve the unique scenic value of the area b) The desire to maintain a visual and physical break in the built environment, their distinct identities and to avoid coalescence c) the constraints of topography and the pressure on available space d) the constraints of the infrastructure.
--

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number

04084

Name

Douglas Barker

Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph

FR1, FR2, FR3, 4.60, 4.62, MIR

Reference

Type

Change

Comment Late

No

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

We act for and are instructed by Mr Douglas Barker of Eden Lodge, Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose.

Our client has instructed us to make representations on his behalf in respect of the Proposed Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Our client wishes to make the following representations:

Fortrose and Rosemarkie

1. Housing: FRI Greenside Farm

Our client does not object to this allocation but because of the sensitive nature of the location - which encroaches on the hinterland - he would have to object in the strongest possible terms if the proposed site boundary were to be moved even marginally.

2. Housing: FR2 Ness gap

Our client does not object to this allocation as presently stated.

3. Community: FR3 Cemetery expansion

Any expansion should be designed/landscaped in a manner which respects the proposed use of this site.

Our client would request better screening of the existing facility (e.g. hedging) as part of any proposed development. The existing site is directly overlooked by the houses next door, which can be distressing for people who are visiting the cemetery (particularly at the top left corner) who would obviously appreciate privacy when paying respects.

4. Options for growth: paragraph 4.60

Our client notes and agrees with the draft text which states that Fortrose and Rosemarkie both benefit from significant natural, heritage, and leisure assets, making them very attractive and popular with residents and visitors alike.

Our client also notes and supports the draft text which states that opportunities for the growth of Fortrose and Rosemarkie are influenced by the desire to maintain a clear visual and physical break in the built environment between them, to retain their distinct identities and avoid coalescence.

Further, expansion of Fortrose is also constrained by steep and very prominent topography and amenity woodland to the west. Land with planning permission at Ness Gap therefore represents the best option for growth.

Lastly, expansion of Rosemarkie is also constrained by the wooded gorge and steep rising farmland to the north and west, with land at Greenside Farm continuing to represent the best option for growth.

These statements in the Proposed Local Development Plan are taken as appropriate recognition by the Highland Council of a long standing principle. This principle of maintaining a clear visual and physical break in the built environment between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, retaining their distinct identities and avoiding coalescence, must be taken as a cornerstone for any future development. Only in this way can the Council act consistently with its approach to supporting the development of housing at FR1 Greenside Farm.

We note, in particular, the Council has in previous publications chosen to place particular emphasis on the following foundations:

“The emerging draft Scottish Planning Policy identifies a focus on positive place



making with one of the six qualities being “Distinctive: places that complement local landscapes....”

"At the MIR stage the Council did not prefer many of the options within the gap other than preferring expansion at the cemetery which is considered only to have a marginal impact, as it preserves the land here as a form of open space, and also preferring the lower Wards Farm site for limited housing".

One of the most common concerns expressed about future development in this locality is of course about potential loss of identity for Rosemarkie and Fortrose if development is allowed on the open land between the settlements. This open land - which provides a clear visual and physical break in the built environment - forms a strategic gap protecting the setting of both settlements and their separate identities.

#### 5. 4.62 Waste Water Treatment works

Our client objected to the expansion of the existing Waste Water Treatment works on land to West of Greenside Farm. In our client's view, this expansion seemed to become necessary because of the poor planning of the original plant.

Our client's firmly held view is that the Council has - again - failed to ensure that the proposals for the current expansion are adequate.

As has been highlighted in correspondence over a considerable period, it is reasonable for our client to be concerned that the recently-consented expansion has again reaffirmed a precedent upon which Scottish Water will rely when seeking to expand the plant further in the future, should the current proposals prove again to be inadequate.

In its report on representations made on the Main Issues Report, amongst other similar statements, the Council noted that:

"There is capacity in the Waste Water Treatment Works for the supported allocations at Ness Gap in Fortrose and for Greenside Rosemarkie, subject to investments in upgrades to the water mains and/or sewer extension/upgrade for phases of development 2017 and onwards. The Plan also identifies that early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be delivered in the Assynt Water Treatment Works. Also at Fortrose the link water main between Black Isle Trunk and the service reservoir has very limited capacity, and assessment will be required to establish extent of water network and storage upgrades. In Rosemarkie new development is likely to have water pressure issues, and a possible solution is installation of a new link main to service. Therefore developers here will need early engagement with Scottish Water to establish an appropriate solution."

Our client calls upon the Council to confirm in the Proposed Local Development Plan that no provision will be made for the further expansion of the Waste Water Treatment works at its present location. Our client objects to any inference that the facility may be expanded.

In the event the Council again chooses to ignore our client's requests, despite a growing industrial facility (having undergone one remedial expansion already) being unnecessarily sited right next to a long standing residential area regardless of the abundance of free available land elsewhere, and despite our client being the nearest neighbour, then (notwithstanding our client's continued abject objection) it must only be expanded towards the hillside, in the opposite direction, and away from, people's homes.

If bad design in the past has sited equipment within the facility, on the residential side of the facility, such that any future expansion would merit siting further equipment/infrastructure on the same side, this is most strongly objected to. This would demonstrate a complete absence of consideration, in earlier designs, for future impact on where people live.

Moreover, the Council will wish to abide by its stated desire to ensure that:

"a focus on positive place making with one of the six qualities being “Distinctive: places that complement local landscapes....”

"the Council did not prefer many of the options within the gap other than preferring expansion at the cemetery which is considered only to have a marginal impact, as it preserves the land here as a form of open space, and

also preferring the lower Wards Farm site for limited housing”.

And we also note that this stated desire amounts to a recognition, by the Council, that the original sewage treatment should not, in fact, be located where it currently is.

#### 6. Main Issues Report and Alternative sites and uses consultation

For the sake of completeness, we attach copies of our letters dated 25 September 2012 on the Main Issues Report consultation, and 24 June 2013 on the Alternative Sites and Uses Consultation. We would ask that the comments in these letters also be taken into account at this stage.

We act for and are instructed by Mr Douglas Barker of Eden Lodge, Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose.

Our client has instructed us to make representations on his behalf in respect of the Main Issues Report which will be used to inform the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Unfortunately, our client did not become aware of the Main Issues Report until after the period for consultation expired at the beginning of July 2012. Our client would request that you still consider his comments at this stage or, failing this, include this letter when considering the terms of the draft Local Development Plan.

Our client wishes to make the following representations:

##### 1. MU2

In the Council's site options the area marked MU2 in the Fortrose and Rosemarkie plan has been designated a mixed use space for retail and small business. Our client is concerned that this mixed use designation will include light industrial units. While the area is designated retail and not industrial, our client notes that mixed use areas in other locations, for example Milton, include light industrial use.

Our client calls upon the Council to provide assurances that MU2 will not become a site for light industrial use, which in turn will ruin the amenity of the area.

Moreover, our client has grave misgivings that the allocation of the mixed use site will set a precedent allowing for future industrial development in the area between Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Our client submits that the housing development proposed at H6 should be located at MU2. This would adjoin H6 to the already established residential area and move the proposed business park (possible light industrial area) away from the residential areas and thus minimise the impact to the area's amenity.

##### 2. Sewage Plant

Our client objected to the expansion of the Scottish Water Waste Water Treatment Plant (“WWTP”) located beside MU2. In our client's view, this expansion seemed to become necessary because of the poor planning of the original plant.

It is also our client's view that the Council has failed to ensure that the proposals for the current expansion are adequate.

It is reasonable for our client to be concerned that the recently-consented expansion has set a precedent upon which Scottish Water will rely when seeking to expand the plant further in the future, should the current proposals prove again to be inadequate.

Our client calls upon the Council to allay his fears by confirming that no provision will be made for the further expansion of the WWTP at its present location.

##### 3. H5

Our client cannot understand why the area marked H5 is proposed for development. This area is part of the long standing land buffer between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, in which both communities have placed great importance for the past 30 years. This buffer is considered an important feature of the local area, and any reduction in this buffer will have a serious impact on the amenity of the area and the character of the locality.

Moreover, the area in question is also grade 1 agricultural land and our client is alarmed that this is being eliminated despite the national importance placed in retaining high quality agricultural land. Our client views this action as a severe lack of foresight which will only benefit a few parties.

##### 4. Increase in housing

Our client is concerned by the lack of consideration given to the increase of housing. In total there are seven areas designated for proposed housing. Yet, there has been no

plans made for upgrading the services of the area to accommodate the large increase in population, including the upgrade of the road between Rosemarkie, Fortrose and Inverness.

Moreover, as the WTP (referred to above) already struggles to service the area in compliance with its CAR Licence, it is logical to assume further expansion will be required. What safeguards are in place to prevent this plant being extended further toward the residential areas? We refer to our comments above.

Any expansion of the WWTP will significantly impact on the amenity of the area and will likely cause a nuisance to the surrounding properties. Our client calls upon the Council to provide assurances that the plant will not be expanded further.

Conclusion

Our client reserves the right to make further comments on the draft local development plan once it has been issued.

We act for and are instructed by Mr Douglas Barker of Eden Lodge, Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose.

Our client has instructed us to make representations on his behalf in respect of the Local Development Plan - Alternative Sites and Uses Consultation which recently opened for consultation and is available until 30th June 2013.

Accordingly, our client wishes to make the following representations concerning:-

Fortrose NS47, Land North of Caravan Park (non-preferred)

Description: Land North of Caravan Park, suggested change from proposed use to use as a Housing Site to tourist related uses.

Our client's comments are:

1 This would result in the irreversible loss of prime grade 1 agricultural land, which is particularly short sighted when a global food crisis looms and this is not just the loss of any agricultural land but some of the best agricultural land in Scotland. Our client views this action as a severe lack of foresight which results in the long term loss by many to the short term benefit of only a few.

2 Our client considers this area is part of the long standing land buffer between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, in which both communities have placed great importance for the past 30+ years. If permitted, this would be the start of the erosion of the age old land barrier that ensures the distinct identities between Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Any reduction in this buffer will have a serious impact on the amenity of the area and the character of the locality.

In addition our client emphatically agrees with the further 'cons' identified by the Council, which are:

Access issues; sensitive site for landscape impact, outwith settlement boundary, not within easy walkable distance of village facilities and possible odour nuisance.

These comments shall be lodged online on the Local Development Plan website.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00920	Name	Mr James Grant	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Pargraph 4.59 Fortrose and Rosemarkie	
Reference	Special Landscape Areas		Type	Support	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

### Representation

Further housing on land on the opposite side of Ness Road from the current Ness Gap Development (and site FR2).( Grid ref 2734E8567N was proposed in an earlier stage of the IMFLDP. it has not been included in the current Plan. This proposal, if reintroduced should be rejected because: It would be constructed on land of high agricultural value It would commence the coalescence of the two villages, which is strongly opposed by the communities (and by THC as stated in the proposed IMFLDP). It would increase traffic flows in existing village high street that are already overcapacity. It would increase unsustainable commuting to Inverness. Suburban development imposed in a rural location detracts from the area and discourages tourism. Highland Council states (para2.25) that they support development if infrastructure, services and facilities required are provided. No infrastructure or facilities are provided by this development; in fact it detracts from existing infrastructure, in particular the already inadequate road system in the area

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04406	Name	The Co-operative Group	Organisation	The Co-operative Group
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Graeme Laing		GL Hearn	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	Land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses.

Representation

2.1 As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses. 2.2 The Council has acknowledged that there is an opportunity for relocated expanded food store in Fortrose, that being a relocation of the existing Co-op store at High Street. At this point it is worth giving some coverage to the rationale for the proposed Co-op relocation. 2.3 The existing Co-op store at High Street extends to 219 sqm (gross) and has been trading for over 12 years. While the High Street store has served our client well, its scale, nature and characteristics no longer best serve the customers who shop at the store. The existing store suffers from a variety of problems which compromise the satisfaction of the customers and the efficient operation of the store, including the following: • Aisles are too narrow resulting in congestion within the store; • General congestion around the checkouts and aisles results in conflict between customers waiting to be served and those manoeuvring through these areas; • The entrance foyer to the store is constricted and does not allow for the full range of customer services to be provided. Congestion also arises in this area; • Checkout provision is insufficient, resulting in frequent and persistent queues; • Congestion within the store makes it difficult to manoeuvre stock trolleys and cages through aisles and shelves to replenish stock. As a result shelves are stacked at higher levels than normally found in foodstores. • The need for stock replenishment during busy times is, in itself, inconvenient for customers as cages take up valuable circulation space; • There is insufficient floorspace to display a sufficient quantity of some goods and insufficient floorspace to offer customers the desired range of goods; • The size and configuration of the storage area is currently inadequate, creating a compromised working environment for warehouse staff; and • Lack of storage space results in increased need for more frequent deliveries which is both environmentally damaging and inefficient from an operational perspective. 2.4 The existing Co-op store is exhibiting the above characteristics and these deficiencies cannot be resolved through the reorganisation of the store’s internal layout. It should be noted that the deficiencies of the existing store have given rise to a series of operational difficulties, resulting in the Council having to pursue enforcement proceedings due to the storage of materials outwith the Co-op store. 2.5 Today, customers expect convenience stores to provide an attractive and spacious shopping environment allowing them to undertake their shopping trip efficiently and in relative comfort. The existing Co-op store does not allow for this and consequently the Co-operative Group is keen to meet customer expectations and demands in Fortrose. 2.6 The Co-op enjoy a reputation for a high level of quality and customer service within their stores but facilities in the existing Fortrose store no longer meet the company’s standards. The Co-operative Group are therefore committed to making a significant investment to provide a new larger foodstore in Fortrose, improving upon the quality of the existing store and improving the overall retail offer in the town. 2.7 It is therefore necessary to provide a new Co-op store in Fortrose in the right location in order to provide a shopping facility that provides a more comprehensive range of goods and services, more closely aimed at meeting shopper’s needs and on a site that is highly accessible to the catchment population and well connected to Fortrose town centre. Sequential Approach 2.8 Scottish Planning Policy is clear that in allocating land for retail development, the local planning authority must have regard to the sequential approach and allocations must be suitable, viable and take commercial realities into account. 2.9 The Co-operative Group consider that the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most suitable location for a relocated and expanded store in Fortrose, offering the opportunity to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned mixed use development, in close proximity to the existing town centre. 2.10 The accompanying retail study demonstrates that there are no suitable or available sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre and that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most suitable suite for new retail development in Fortrose. The land at Rosemarkie Road lies only 190 metres from the defined town centre and offers the opportunity to create a development that will be well connected to the town centre. 2.11 Secondly, the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most commercially suitable site for new retail development in Fortrose. The Co-op require to maintain a high profile trading position in the town and this is something which the land at Rosemarkie Road would provide, allowing the Co-op to develop a new store that would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and local businesses. Retail Capacity 2.12 Having established that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most favourable site sequentially and commercially, we have given consideration to whether

new retail development can be accommodated at Rosemarkie Road without having any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.13 Firstly, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the proposed convenience store is not a large supermarket and is of a scale that is designed to improve the existing retail offer of the town but is commensurate with the role and function of Fortrose. At 557 sqm the proposed retail store would fall well below the 2,500 sqm threshold which SPP requires a retail impact assessment to be undertaken. 2.14 A retail study has been prepared in support of our clients proposals and this demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op store without there being any impacts on the vitality and viability of Fortrose town centre. 2.15 In terms of key findings, the study demonstrates that the resident population within the Fortrose catchment area generate approximately £12.68m of convenience goods expenditure and only £5.30m of this expenditure is captured by existing stores within the Fortrose catchment. 2.16 The study indicates that up to £7.38m of the convenience goods expenditure generated by the Fortrose catchment is currently leaking to more distant locations, most probably to Inverness. 2.17 The store proposed at Rosemarkie Road would have a company average turnover of approximately £3.08m, with £2.8m drawn from the Fortrose catchment. Of this £2.8m, £1.73m would be diverted from the existing Co-op store in Fortrose and the remaining £1.1m would be drawn from the £7.33m of trade that is currently leaking from the Fortrose catchment. 2.18 Given the scale of capacity within the Fortrose catchment area it is evident that there is sufficient expenditure within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support a new store at Rosemarkie Road without there being any negative impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.19 The provision of a larger Co-op store in Fortrose will simply help to retain more shoppers within the town, thereby reducing the number of shoppers travelling a longer distance to the large foodstores located outwith the catchment area and clawing back expenditure to the town. 2.20 The proposals would not have any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. The other convenience retailers in Fortrose town centre provide specialist bakery and butchery products and are well supported by the local community. A relocated Co-op store would not have an instore bakery or fresh butchery counter and therefore would not compete with these well established businesses that the Co-op already trade alongside. Moreover, with the proposed site being only 190 metres from the town centre, there are likely to be spin off benefits for the town centre by developing a new store in such close proximity to the High Street. Other Relevant Matters 2.21 The land at Rosemarkie Road is the most sequentially preferable site in Fortrose for new retail development and a new store of the scale and nature proposed can be accommodated on the site without there being any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.22 In terms of other relevant matters, a well-designed development on the site would not only deliver a new planned defensible boundary on the town's northern edge but would also achieve a more uniform boundary when considered in conjunction with adjacent land uses, thus improving the defensibility of the edge generally. 2.23 The Rosemarkie Road site relates more in character to the existing settlement and should be considered more as a suitable site on the edge of the existing settlement than a meaningful component of the countryside. The proposed development would knit into the existing urban fabric and will also allow for the creation of a sensitive, clearly defined and well contained interface with the countryside to the north. Contained development at Rosemarkie would form an appropriate edge to the settlement and would not form urban sprawl or encourage coalescence in any way. 2.24 The proposed development will have no significant adverse impacts upon the environment, landscape, heritage resources and nature conservation. Rather, it will have a beneficial impact upon the above through high quality proposals that respect local character, delivering an improved landscape setting. 2.25 In overall terms, the proposal complies with national, strategic and local planning policies for retail development. Having regard to the proposal's ability to deliver additional choice to Fortrose, the absence of any sequentially preferable sites and its compliance with planning policy, it is evident that the proposed store represents a valuable opportunity to meet the needs of Fortrose and is therefore commended to The Highland Council for inclusion within the emerging local development plan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01139	Name	Erlend Tait	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	Fortrose and Rosemarkie		Type	Change	Comment Late

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Infrastructure inadequacies must be addressed e.g. roads have deteriorated with the recent increase of traffic on minor roads. Swimming pool for the Black Isle?

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04369	Name	Iain Sime	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.60	
Reference			Type	Support	Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

I warmly endorse the proposal to maintain the 'gap' between Rosemarkie and Fortrose and thereby maintain the separate character of the two settlements. The proposed plan does this by maintaining the gap by correctly seeking to prevent development to the south and north of the main road between the two settlements.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	02203	Name	Mr Roy Sinclair	Organisation	Inverness Rowing Club
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	Fortrose and Rosemarkie		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

The draft correctly identifies the status of Fortrose as the primary service centre for the Black Isle. But it fails to mention that as a main centre for education, leisure and recreation for the whole 10,000 or so population of the area, the area has not got a swimming pool, the provision of which is desired throughout the Black Isle for which the community has campaigned for over 60 years. I urge, therefore, that the fourth indented para. in 4.59 be re-worded specifically to mention a swimming pool as a main possible enhancement. (The wording in the existing plan is an example to follow) In the Action Plan in the relevant place reference to Highland Highlife should be eliminated or qualified as HH has no funds of its own and simply acts as an agent for the Council. It is for Highland Council to decide policy in regard to provision of leisure and recreation facilities and to make capital and revenue funding available to achieve such provision or to assist others with funding so that they can do so.

#### Representation

The draft correctly identifies the status of Fortrose as the primary service centre for the Black Isle and states that housing expansion proposed will help to sustain this role. It however fails to mention that as a main centre for education, leisure and recreation for the whole 10,000 or so population of the area, the area has not got a swimming pool, the provision of which is desired throughout. The Black Isle community has campaigned for such a facility for more than 60 years. A few years ago it seemed within reach had it not been for Highland Council's decision not to support it with the modest annual revenue subsidy required. The land and Planning Permission (purified) for a pool exists as does the will to make it a reality given modest Council backing. As some 1000 new houses are planned, the case for a pool is now even stronger.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------

Customer Number	01139	Name	Erlend Tait	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59	
Reference	Fortrose and Rosemarkie		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

Wording 'Land is identified which could accommodate over 130 new homes' should be changed.

#### Representation

'At least 130 homes' is a useless phrase as it could be taken to mean a limitless number.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------



Customer Number	04413	Name	Mrs Wylie	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Kerri McGuire		Graham And Sibbald	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Pages 80 - 82 Fortrose and Rosemarkie	
Reference	Main Issues Report Reference H6		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Our client requests that land at Upper Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Reference H6) is allocated for residential use.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mrs Wylie. Our client owns the land at Upper Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H6) and wishes to object to the exclusion of this site as a residential development allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan. We consider that the allocation of this site will allow the Council to maintain an effective housing land supply to address the housing requirements and demand for this area. Current Policy Allocation Part of this site at Upper Wards is currently allocated for residential development within the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (adopted February 2007). The adopted plan allocates this site for a courtyard style development on the site of a former steading and the adjacent land. The Background text for Fortrose in the adopted Local Plan (page 72) details that the town maintains a high level of housing demand, particularly from people who work in Inverness or are retired. Housing predictions set out in page 72 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan details that there is a combined requirement for up to 144 more houses within Fortrose and Rosemarkie by 2011, with a further 96 from 2011 to 2017. The allocation of land at Upper Wards for residential development allows for the Council to maintain an effective housing land supply within Fortrose. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments The land at Upper Wards was not identified as a preferred site at the Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation stage. The Council recognises that part of the site is allocated for residential use in the adopted Local Plan and that this site presents an opportunity for significant expansion to the north east of the settlement. However, the Council considered that the site is outwith the active travel distance of the settlement centre, road infrastructure improvements would be required and the development of this site would have significant visual impacts. As stated in our previous representations to the MIR consultation, it is not our client’s intentions to develop the whole site within their ownership for residential use. We recognise that this would not be a scale suitable for a settlement of this size and the development of the site as a whole would have landscape and visual impacts. The scale proposed is in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. The development of the site proposed would also ensure that there remains a distinct separation between Rosemarkie and Fortrose. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled ‘Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.’ In relation to site H6 at Fortrose the Council has stated that: “The site is located further up the hill from H3 and additional road improvements would be necessary to enable development. It is also considered that the site is sensitive in terms of its impact on the landscape, introducing a cluster of development in the upper hillside location where the landscape can only successfully accommodate isolated dispersed development. More substantial clusters of housing would appear inappropriate in this location and would appear as an unsympathetic extension to Fortrose. It is considered that the current isolated dispersed housing pattern here reflects the upland farming landscape here and helps maintain the accessibility issues from the steep slope and lack of footway. For these reasons it is considered that this site is inappropriate for housing development and it is recommended that it should not be allocated in the Plan.” We consider that the allocation of this site presents an opportunity to create a low density housing development that is sympathetic to the settlement pattern and landscaped setting. The design of the development can be controlled through planning policy requirements for a design statement/development brief to be prepared for the site. Planning Justification for the Continued Allocation of Site The Proposed Local Development Plan proposes to only allocate one residential site within Fortrose. The allocated site at Ness Gap (Site Reference: FR2) is zoned for 80 units. Tulloch Homes has obtained outline planning permission for this site. This has been followed up by the submission of a number of detailed applications. Work has commenced on the site and Tulloch Homes are actively marketing the residential development. This site has started on site and it is assumed will be completed in the short – medium term. As this is the only housing site identified for Fortrose in the Proposed Plan, we consider that the Council has not identified an effective housing land supply for this area. It is identified in the adopted Local Plan that Fortrose attracts a high housing demand as it is within commutable distance from Inverness. This demand is likely to increase and the residential market continues to improve. The Chief Planner issued a letter to all the Heads of Planning on the 29th October 2010 in relation to providing an effective supply of land for housing. This letter details that: “Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuing generous supply of land for housing. Planning authorities should monitor land supply through the annual housing land audit, prepared in conjunction with housing and infrastructure providers. Development plans should identify triggers for the release of future phases of effective sites where a 5 year effective supply is not being maintained.” The allocation of the land at Upper Wards for residential development would allow the Council to maintain an effective housing land

supply to meet current and anticipated increase in demand at Fortrose. This is an effective housing site that is free from constraints that would impact on the delivery of the site for residential use. The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. Our client has undertaken pre-application discussions with Erica McArthur of The Highland Council in relation to the proposed submission of a planning application for a residential development at this location. This demonstrates a commitment to bring the site forward for development. The land at Upper Wards represents a natural extension to the settlement boundary and would allow the Council to demonstrate a sufficient supply of housing land for this location. The site is capable of being developed for low density housing and can be sensitively designed to mitigate against landscape and visual impact. We therefore request that this site is allocated for residential development.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04139	Name	Laurence Lockhart	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	-------------------	--------------	--

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

Section	2.Guiding and Delivering Development	Paragraph	
---------	--------------------------------------	-----------	--

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

Comment Changes

A toilet Facility at Chanonry Point Car Park
--

#### Representation

Whilst increasing numbers of vehicles traverse Ness Road to and from Channonry Point Car Park and obstruct the smooth rotation of the golfing teams clearway to tee off, the owners and dogs from these vehicles disembark and discharge their urine and faeces at the car park along the Access route to the beach , on the beach and under the tree/bush on the foreshore, generating a mounting health biohazard. There is a serious risk of transmission of human bacteria , protozoans, virions and prions between men women and children at these loci which warrants the provision of a civilised toilet facility (which could be built on the island at the Car Park with a subterranean tank processing system) Permission should be included in the local plan and the wherewithall to finance the project should be another matter. This is a separate matter from addressing the second danger which is from the from the dog faeces.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	02037	Name	Mr Ian Carus	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Page 82	
Reference	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

Proposed Primary School should be re-inserted in the masterplan. Proposed Swimming Pool should be inserted in the masterplan The A832 must be upgraded before any more development. If this is not possible, developments should not take place

#### Representation

Site FR2 Proposed Primary School The Primary School was a major part of the development of FR2 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 Quote: 11. A site of 1.8 ha. shall be safeguarded adjacent to the Deans and Ness Roads for the provision of a primary school with playing field, serving the Fortrose and Rosemarkie area In the new IMFLDP it states “No development of site identified for a primary school on masterplan prior to the Sustainable Schools Estates Review” Surely the site has to be identified prior to the Review and then if the review finds there is no demand for a new school only then should it be removed from the masterplan. Indeed, with all the planned new extra housing and the ageing primary school in Avoch there might well be a demand for a primary school in Fortrose. Site FR2 Black Isle Swimming Pool Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states 10. Land is reserved for expansion of Black Isle Leisure Centre to provide a swimming pool, a project being led by the community. An area of approximately 0.6 ha. is reserved for this purpose and for additional community/leisure facilities to meet local needs. Remarkably and disgracefully, especially to those of us who have campaigned for a new Pool for many years, the swimming pool does not even get a mention in the new plan. Road Infrastructure relating to FR1 and FR2 Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states “The need to reconstruct the dangerous A832 route between Fortrose and Avoch is a major concern.” Many people in Fortrose and Rosemarkie believe that the infrastructure for the proposed developments, particularly the A832 between the Fairy Glen in Rosemarkie and Avoch is totally unsuitable and before any further development is approved something must be done about it. Having attended various meetings organised by the Council to discuss improvements to Fortrose High Street, it has become clear that any changes made can only be minor and cosmetic.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00396	Name	Mr William Paton	Organisation	Scottish Water
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.62 Page 80	
Reference	Fortrose & Rosemarkie		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

Request change to second sentence in paragraph starting "Early engagement....." Suggested amendment: "Early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be planned and delivered across the lifespan of the plan and beyond at the Assynt Water Treatment Works"

#### 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	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01299	Name	Ms Brenda Steele	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	3.Strategy for Growth Areas		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Forget any expansion in Fortrose. There has been far too much already, and the basic infrastructure cannot support what is already passed planning. Moreover much of the changes are entirely developer profit led and do not support the needs of the community. There is a great lack of affordable housing and a lack of mid-level housing. In addition, there is no provision for any other type of housing other than developer led. This is in direct contradiction of national objectives and is totally unacceptable. There is no mention in the plan of the place of agriculture in the life of the Black Isle. Why;? This is one of the the major features of this area but it merits not one single word in the plan. That is unbelievably pathetic!

Representation

I have to say that the selection of Fortrose as a centre for the Black Isle and its untrammelled expansion without proper consideration of the basic suitability of the infrastructure appals me.. The town has a narrow congested High Street which cannot be expanded to accommodate more traffic . There is only limited parking in the centre of town and no location for more parking. Your solution is to move the major retail store to the edge of town, an act which has been shown to be detrimental to the viability of communities throughout the land. How stupid is that? Then there is the fiasco with Scottish water spending vast sums on a fancy new plant which did not work and had to be changed back to the old fashioned method - smelly and nasty? Then there is the matter of the Academy . During the summer we were assured that there was plenty of capacity, but now we have a cap on the first year. Why were the estimates so wrong and will the estimates on the need for a primary school be any better. Given your track record I very much doubt it. Our NHS primary care unit has turfed out all out of area patients. For those with ongoing or chronic problems, this is a loss in terms of care continuity. Moreover, the Ness gap is not complete, so we have no idea of whether they can cope with the number of patients from the new housing already approved ot not - yet you propose to approve yet more new housing in the area. This is unbelievable incompetence arrogance and stupidity.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	03807	Name	Paula Sime	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Reduction in housing density/assurance that room for school expansion remains

Representation

FR1 and FR2 will bring 130 new families to our community. This will have a huge impact on local transport and services, however my biggest concern at present is school provision. The plan mentions the primary school site and the review that is currently being undertaken, but it doesn't seem to take the secondary school into consideration. The current S1 intake at Fortrose Academy is closed as the school is full. What is going to happen once all these new homes are built and even more children move into the area? Where is there room for the high school to expand? Are our children going to be bused to Dingwall or Alness because new homes are more important than local services?

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04423	Name	Trustees of the late Mrs E Clouston	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Alastair Robb		MacNeill & Critchley	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.59-4.62	
Reference	Site H3 in the Main Issues Report		Type	Change	Comment Late No

#### Comment Changes

We are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan in Part 4 – Development Allocation for Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Our representation relates to the deletion of Area H3 from the previous draft of the Plan, known as The Wards, Fortrose, which is held in the ownership of the Trustees of the late Mrs Eve Clouston. We request that Area H3 be re-inserted in the plan.

#### Representation

As stated, we are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan in Part 4 – Development Allocation for Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Our representation relates to the deletion from the previous draft of the Plan of Area H3, known as The Wards, Fortrose, which is held in the ownership of the Trustees of the late Mrs Eve Clouston, who died in 2006. We request that Area H3 be re-inserted in the plan. Area H3 is shown on the Main Issues Report plan. The area allocated under heading H3 was shown as a Council-preferred site in the Main Issues Report, in which the significant pros were stated as it having already been allocated at least in part in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan and that it would “round off” the settlement to the north-east of Fortrose. The cons were stated as being - outwith active travel distance of settlement centre, - roads infrastructure improvements required - and potential landscape impact. Area H3 was 1 of only 2 areas shown as Council preferred sites, other than the two areas which are now contained in the Proposed Plan under zoning FR1 and FR2. In the Summary of Comments received on the Main Issues Report prepared by Highland Council, the principal objections to the Plan as then drafted are stated to be preserving the distinct identity and character of Fortrose and Rosemarkie, infrastructure of service provisions, social integration, impact on Conservation Areas, and loss of good farmland. The specific reference to site H3, however, indicates that there was “significantly more limited objection to the Council-preferred H3 site”, and recognised there was some support for H3, with reference to it being poor quality farmland, and that quality landscaping / planting could ameliorate the landscape impact. However, the Council’s response, under the heading “Common Issues Relating to Potential Development Sites” indicates that, in considering the objections regarding preserving the distinct identifies of Fortrose and Rosemarkie, they did not prefer many of the other potential housing options within the gap between the communities. This is reflected in the Main Issues Report in that the Council did not prefer many of the other options within the gap, but did prefer expansion of the cemetery and preferring the Lower Wards Farm site for limited housing development on H3. The Council, however, then state that, in response to the objections, which had already been stated to be “significantly more limited”, they consider that the H3 site should be removed from the Development Plan, because of its landscape impact and other factors. Under the specific heading of “H3 The Wards”, the Council’s pros could be summarised as follows:- 1. Access from the East Watergate main road is preferred. 2. The eight houses proposed is a more suitable capacity than the previous 12-16 houses for which this area was zoned in the earlier Plan. 3. It offers additional choice and flexibility in the housing land supply. 4. It is not prime agricultural land. The negatives are:- 1. Impact on landscape and visibility. 2. Access difficulties. The Council also comment that the effectiveness of the site may be questioned, considering that Planning Consent has not been obtained to enable its development, notwithstanding it appearing in previous Local Plans. We would comment on these points as follows. 1. Landscape and Visual Amenity and Extension of Settlement Boundary As the Council have indicated, this site has been allocated for housing in various past Local Plans and lies within the Settlement boundary shown in previous plans and at earlier stages of the Proposed Plan. Objections and representations regarding the preservation of the gap between Fortrose and Rosemarkie have been made in most consultations, but as is stated in the summary of objections to the Main Issues Report, in the current consultation there was significantly more limited objection to H3 on these grounds. The site lies partly above an existing housing development and the cemetery will also lie above the proposed extension to the cemetery FR3. Suitable mitigating landscaping and planting requirements and careful design can mitigate the landscape impact. This can also clearly be seen from the limited visibility impact of other development carried out on East Watergate road in recent years. It is submitted that this relatively small development, properly designed, will not have a detrimental visibility impact to the extent that it should be removed from the proposed Plan. 2. Access and Infrastructure It is accepted that the site has some challenges regarding development due to its steep topography and additional requirements regarding improved access and drainage. However, previous investigations by a proposed developer indicate that these are matters which can be resolved and are no different from many other housing sites. 3. Effectiveness of the Site for Housing and Housing Demand When earlier zoned, this site was seen as a more long-term area for housing development. Following the death of Mrs Clouston in 2006, it became apparent that the ongoing use of the land for agricultural use was not viable and discussions began with various parties regarding how it might be developed. This involved discussions regarding use of alternative accesses and other aspects. In 2008, a specific developer approached the Trustees with a view to obtaining Planning Consent

for development. At that time, the land was zoned for 12-16 houses, with the preferred access coming from MacKeddie Drive. The proposed developer carried out extensive investigations and preparation of engineering plans, particularly in respect of the road layout and drainage within the development, which indicated that, due to the topography of the site, a lower density of 6-8 houses would be a more practical and viable development of the site, as would access being taken from Watergate instead of MacKeddie Drive. The ongoing process of discussions with the local Planning Department and other interested parties and the preparation of plans took a considerable period of time. In the meantime, the property recession had developed and demand for building land had stalled. That particular developer withdrew from negotiations at the end of 2011 / beginning of 2012, as they did not wish to proceed with further substantial costs at that stage, which would have been involved in a new Planning Application required at that time. Due to financial constraints, the owners require developer input to the process of applying for planning permission and a decision was made to delay until the property market recovered, so that the project would be more attractive and viable to developers, considering the infrastructure and Planning costs which would be incurred in pursuing a Planning Application. This was done also in the knowledge that although then zoned for 12-16 houses, the Main Issues Report indicated that the zoning would likely be reduced to 6-8 houses, still as preferred land. The owners had no prior indication that the preferred status would be removed in the Proposed Plan. Summary The Proposed Plan is intended to reflect preferred zoning for the next ten year period and only two areas in Fortrose and Rosemarkie have been allocated for housing, one being the large partly developed area in the Ness Gap (FR1) and the second being a relatively small, but high density, development in Rosemarkie (FR2). The area at The Wards (formerly H3) offers additional choice and flexibility in housing supply, in offering a lower density and differing location for housing. It seems particularly perverse for this land to be removed from its long-term zoning at this time, just as the economy is recovering and it is likely that there will be an increasing interest in housing development land. There is little doubt that there would be demand for individual houses on this land, in the event that Planning Permission and infrastructure arrangements are put in place. We therefore request that Area H3 be included as housing land in the Plan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01139	Name	Erlend Tait	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	-------------	--------------	--

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

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	4.59
---------	---------------------------	-----------	------

Reference	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
-----------	-------------------------	------	--------	--------------	----

Comment Changes

As per representation.
------------------------

Representation

High quality farmland such as the raised beaches on Chanonry point need to be preserved for farming for local food production.
--

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01291	Name	Dr June Bevan-Baker	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	2.Guiding and Delivering Development		Paragraph	7.5Access toTransport Assessment	
Reference	FR2		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Full publicised revised Transport Assessment (including further mitigation) to be published before further house building applications are considered. Site for Primary School to be retained INDEFINITELY whatever the Sustainable Schools Estates Review proposes. No Retail development to be allowed.

Representation

The Council I trust will take notice of the feelings of the community of Rosemarkie and Fortrose residents at the Public meeting held in the School Theatre in July 2013. They voted unanimously against a supermarket development; against any development which would affect the separation and distinct characters of the 2 villages (eg FR1) and in favour of a Primary School. They expressed great anxiety about the dangerous and often congested High Street in Fortrose and have observed no improvement so far.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--