

Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

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

Customer Number	04230	Name	Lovat Highland Estates Ltd	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)	Mr George Reynolds		Reynolds Architecture Ltd		
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.112	
Reference	The north side of the A862 is developable		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Inclusion of the area to the north of the A862 at the village periphery per the attached plan.

Representation

This area was submitted at the call for sites at the request of the Planning Authority. Access is available off the B9164 which is a safer point of access than the sites to the south which would access off the A862. The development of the is corner of the village rounds off the existing settlement pattern creating a crossroads feature. The ground is flat and there are no issues with mature trees or gradients. The development of the site would not require disruption to the A862 for infrastructure crossings.

Allocated to	Inchmore	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	03120	Name	Mr James MacDonald-Brown	Organisation	JMB Design
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.110 - 4.113	
Reference	H3 Main Issues Report Spring 2012		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Re-interdiction of H3 of Main Issues Report Spring 2012

Representation

A Planning application Ref. No.12/00441/FUL was initially submitted after consultation with the councils Local Plan Section concerning what at that time was considered to be a natural extension of the village envelope and tidy up the entrance to the village, this was in the current application being initially withdrawing and resubmitted on the bases of the anticipated Spring 2012 I.M.F.L.P. which was in fact the case as *per page 25 of the Main Issues Report. The proposal is now to withdraw the site from the I.M.F.L.P. due to objections from SEPA who has expressed concerns about flooding potential. We have 3 testimonials spanning between 50 – 70 years from residents who have lived on the site or in the vicinity of the site indicating the site hasn't in their experience flooding at any time. I would therefore doubt that SEPA's records extend back this far. I understand that at the public meeting in Beauly it was indicated to a reprehensive of the client that if a Flood Risk Assessment was to be carried out satisfactorily and the house floor levels possible raised and submitted before April 2014 that the site could be reintroduced, therefore on that bases the client is prepared to commission a F.R.A.*

Allocated to	Inchmore	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00396	Name	Mr William Paton	Organisation	Scottish Water	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.116 Page 116		
Reference	Inchmore		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Request amendment to last sentence in para 4.116 beginning "Early engagement.....". Suggest substitution with "Early engagement is required to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands at Glenconvinth Water Treatment Works and Kiltarlity Waste Water Treatment Works in the future can be delivered in line with development.

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	Inchmore	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00396	Name	Mr William Paton	Organisation	Scottish Water	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.113 Page 115		
Reference	Inchmore		Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Request amendment to last sentence in para 4.113 beginning "Early engagement.....". Suggest substitution with "Early engagement is required to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands at Glenconvinth Water Treatment Works in the future can be delivered in line with development.

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	Inchmore	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04307	Name	William MacMillan	Organisation	Seafield Motors (Inverness) Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.113	
Reference	Site Ref H3 and H5		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

I would like site preferred site H3, which was included in 2012 IMFLP and subsequently removed, to be included back into the current IMFLP.

Representation

Inchmore IV57PX – Site H3 Preferred in MIR 2012 IMFLP Site H3 has a current planning application (Ref 12/00441/FUL). This site was included in the 2012 IMFLP, but now seems to have been removed from the latest version. It is mentioned in the latest IMFLP, that this has been done due to objections from SEPA, who have possible concerns re potential flooding. The neighbouring site, H5 in Inchmore, also appears on the same potential flood map (attached), however it has not been removed from the latest IMFLP. Both these sites were preferred in the 2012 IMFLP, both appear on the same map, with similar concerns from SEPA, therefore I would think it only fair and reasonable that both sites be treated in a similar manner. I would therefore request that preferred site H3 be re-introduced back into the current IMFLP, as it was in the 2012 IMFLP, and be treated in a similar manner to site H5. Any concerns that SEPA may have regarding both sites H3 and H5 can then be dealt with in a similar manner. A flood risk assessment, and any other viable options could then be considered at the appropriate time, in the normal course of any planning application that may be submitted.

Allocated to	Inchmore	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00973	Name	Mr Paul Whitefoot	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.113 Inchmore	
Reference	I		Type	Support	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to endorse the decision to stop development to the east of the village. Filling the central portion of the village in areas IC1 and IC2 will encourage more heart to the village and less ribbon style development. I would support only development with IC1 &2. It is not clear from the plan whether development is to be permitted within the boundary that has not been specifically identified in the plan.The amenity area in to the north of the old primary school is similarly not identified for specific safeguarding and I would wish this area to be safeguarded for amenity use.

Allocated to	Inchmore	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	03968	Name	Andrew Melville	Organisation	ref. Inchmore Hall IC3
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Inchmore Hall IC3	
Reference	Inchmore Hall IC3		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

I would like proposed use for Inchmore Hall (IC3) changed to Mixed Use, ie suitable for business and / or residential.

Representation

Inchmore Hall IC3 I request change of allocation to Mixed Use, for the reason that it was and is difficult to find a tenant for a building of this type in this location. If in the future a suitable tenant cannot be found then residential development should, in my view, at least be an option. I do not see why this site has been singled out for retention as business use only. There was a shop site in Inchmore until recently and that site could equally have been allocated as business use instead of allowing full scale residential development. Also, it would have been on the side of the road where most residents live, negating the need for perilous journeys across a busy road. I do accept that the Inchmore hall site has a long established, safe and well used vehicular entrance / exit and this no doubt makes it attractive as a commercial venue, but not everyone travels to shops / business premises by car, and in my view there are similar sites in the area with good entrance / exit facilities. If the building is redeveloped in the future, say for business use, it may be that tenants will be more easily found, and encouraged to take up a long-term tenancy if he/she/they can live on the premises, ie in a house built on to the premises, or, in a flat or flats above. With this in mind I respectfully request that the site now be allocated to Mixed Use. Thank you Andrew Melville.

Allocated to	Inchmore	IC3	Former Inchmore Hall	
--------------	----------	-----	----------------------	--