

# Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

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

Customer Number	01036	Name	Braham Estate	Organisation	
Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)		Administrator Yvonne Macdonald		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	MB1		Type	Change	Comment Late
			No		

### Comment Changes

This objection is to the omission of a land allocation south-west of Maryburgh for mixed use development including approximately 270 houses. It concerns the effectiveness of the allocation MB1 as presented in the PLDP, and presents an alternative that will also facilitate delivery of MB1. (1) Add “Mixed Use; as MB3 (ie. MU3 in MIR) Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; subject to access (to the A835) to be agreed with Transport Scotland and a developer masterplan”. (2) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6. (3) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (ie. MU3 as proposed at (1) above) to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for “early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity of infrastructure and services”.

### Representation

Grounds of Objection 1.This objection concerns the omission from the PLDP of the some 24 ha. of land at Braham Estate, adjoining Maryburgh to the south and west. It should be read in conjunction with the representations lodged on behalf of Braham Estate to the MIR (MU2/MU3) and with the planning authority’s response; and with a representation in relation to MB2 lodged on behalf of Braham Estate. It is not an objection to any of the Braham Estate lands allocated at MB1 or MB2 which are available and should remain identified for development. 2.The grounds of objection are that the PLDP presents an ineffective framework for expansion of Maryburgh; and that its contribution to a Growth Area economic development strategy, as a sustainable community is suppressed as result. Specifically: •that land at MB1 was found by evidence not to be able to be assembled and delivered in the terms the PLDP proposes; •that land owned by Braham Estate (24 ha.) which the Council acknowledges as suitable for development and the appropriate direction in which Maryburgh should grow, provides an alternative that would not be dependent on land assembly and would also facilitate development of MB1 and MB2; •that Scottish Planning Policy 2010 does enable access from the A835 to serve expansion of Maryburgh if it is found to be feasible; and that it can only be properly investigated and expansion objectives for Maryburgh delivered, if the 24 ha. of land above is allocated in the development plan, albeit with that caveat. Following from this objection the IMFLDP should allocate 24 ha. of land at Braham Estate for mixed use (primarily housing); there should be a revised framework for phasing development; and adjustments to the Ross-shire Growth Area (Vision and Strategy) reflecting the PLDP acknowledgement that Maryburgh is identified as part of the Growth Area and offers significant potential for housing growth, consistent with Map 6. The Proposal 3.The Braham Estate land adjoins Maryburgh to the south/west. It straddles Dunglass Road and connects with the Braham Estate interests at MB2 and (part) MB1. The Council agrees (para. 4.156) that this is the future direction for growth, “if suitable access can be gained”. On that basis and given the factors affecting MB1 - set out in the response to the MIR and as follows - the planning authority is obliged to facilitate investigation of “suitable access”. 4.The land requires a new access to the A835(T). Scottish Planning Policy 2010 states “the case for such junctions will be considered where significant economic growth or regeneration benefits can be demonstrated”. 5.Maryburgh is located in the strategic Ross-shire East Growth Area as identified in the PLDP (Map 6) and it is linked to the national road network, the primary transport artery within the Growth Area. The Growth Area includes the major Oil& Gas/Renewables site at Nigg recognised in the National Planning Framework as a strategic contributor to the national economy and prosperity. 6.This economic development strategy is founded on “land for 5,750 homes and 900 ha. of employment land focussed on existing settlements and employment areas”. Maryburgh is an existing settlement; it lies within 3km of a “key service centre” (Dingwall) (PLDP para. 3.12), and between two “strategic allocations” for economic development (Dingwall and Muir of Ord) (para. 3.11). The role of Maryburgh in supporting that strategy and economic development objectives derives from its position within the Growth Area and is evident by the PLDP recognition that “significant potential exists for housing growth” (para. 4.152). 7.In terms of supporting economic growth - and the national economy - that is

as strong a case as there could be for access to A835(T). When that access would deliver an effective and available land supply within the Growth Area that case is strengthened. 8.This gives further emphasis to the obligation on the planning authority to facilitate proper investigation of an access to the A835(T). That can be accomplished by the allocation of the Brahan Estate lands (24 ha.) for development, with appropriate caveat, subject to agreement on all relevant matters including access to the A835. An allocation of land in the development plan would give the necessary security to commit resources to a Transport Assessment ie. the evidence base for consideration by Transport Scotland. Should this be preceded by a Transport Scotland appraisal, then the development plan is the basis on which that should be initiated. Unless the land is allocated and - provided an access is proven to be acceptable - its potential for development recognised, then that investigation would not reasonably proceed. 9.Scottish Planning Policy 2010 - in the interests of sustainable development - states (para. 77) "Planning authorities should set out a settlement strategy in the development plan to provide a long term context for development. Key considerations in a settlement strategy are:...

- the efficient use of existing...land and infrastructure,
- accessibility of homes...by a range of transport options,
- co-ordination of housing land release with investment in infrastructure including transport...;
- the deliverability of the strategy...and that (para. 166) "The relationship between transport and land use has a strong influence on sustainable economic growth, and this should be taken into account when preparing development plans and in development management decisions".

The planning authority should be pro-active and seek to facilitate development particularly in a Growth Area. Not to do so in these circumstances, especially when it agrees that growth should take place to the south-west of Maryburgh, is to frustrate development. 10.The land MB1 has already been the subject of a collaborative initiative - during 2007-11 - by the landowners in consortium to make that land effective through the masterplan approach as prescribed in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (the existing development plan) adopted 2006. The purpose was a comprehensive approach, land assembly, shared infrastructure and incremental development. 11.That initiative included the purchase of property and land to form a distributor access; obtaining a planning permission to form the access; an approved loan of £0.626m by the Highland Council to fund land assembly and feasibility/masterplanning; and a Proposed Minute of Agreement by the Highland Housing Alliance to underwrite purchase of the land (MB1) by that agency as a basis for marketing and infrastructure provision. Despite those initiatives, the land MB1 could not be assembled and it failed to deliver the expansion of Maryburgh as proposed in the development plan. 12.The PLDP makes provision for that same allocation (albeit slightly reduced to the west), same masterplan approach and the same phasing principles (from the east) with no changes to the purpose of the Ross & Cromarty East Local Development Plan. That it has been tried and failed already - and recently at that - does not make the land unsuitable for expansion per se, but it cannot be guaranteed as effective and deliverable; and for that it should be an option only. Despite the agency intervention and approved public funding, it was not possible to assemble MB1. What is required is a "generous supply of appropriate and effective sites being made available" and that "wider economic objectives are taken into account" as Scottish Planning Policy 2010 (para. 70) states, and a strategy that offers a new dimension, not dependent on land assembly and which can be delivered to the market. 13.Further to the Council's acknowledgement of its suitability, the Brahan Estate land - which is in one ownership and not dependent on any third party - would facilitate that; and accommodate a wider range of uses and activities than the PLDP proposes ie. including, business, community and structural open space, much more in keeping with the expectations of a sustainable community. 14.The new dimension the Brahan Estate land would bring would also facilitate the land the PLDP allocates ie. the delivery of MB1 and MB2 by introducing flexibility in phasing, enabling development to proceed from the west and the east. That is bound to improve the prospects of developing MB1 and represents a positive response to the constraints affecting MB1; and a fundamental enhancement of the strategy the planning authority promotes. 15.That is material also because the access and phasing plan the PLDP promotes for MB1 is understood to present a threshold at 70 houses that requires Transport Assessment in light of the implications for the A835 roundabout/Proby Street. Were a Transport Assessment to reveal a constraint and the capacity of 200 houses curtailed, that outcome would have implications for both MB1 and MB2. 16.The Brahan Estate land would facilitate wider transport and circulation advantages to Maryburgh and betterment to the A835. These include relieving the A835 roundabout/Proby Street; and the potential to rationalise existing Estate junctions with the A835 further west which facilitate access to public events, a significant outdoor recreation resource, visitor facilities, a caravan site, farm and industrial premises. 17.Given the potential it brings to resolving a confirmed "brake" on the availability MB1 and MB2, and the Council's agreement to development in principle, there is no justification for omitting a substantial land holding adjoining an existing settlement, accessible to the sub-regional transport network, and which serves a "Growth Area" founded on economic development and major employment. 18.It is even less justifiable when the MIR identified the Brahan Estate land as preferred, the community raises no substantive opposition and the Council itself endorses the Brahan Estate lands as the favoured direction for expansion of Maryburgh. The planning authority states (Schedule 4) "The delivery of this site (MB1) is key to the future expansion of Maryburgh". What is "key to the future expansion of Maryburgh" is the allocation of land that can deliver expansion. Masterplan/Development Brief 19.MB1 and MB2 appear to be subject to "a masterplan/development brief to be adopted as supplementary guidance". This should not be exclusive to the Council, but available to be prepared by landowner/developers. It should be termed a "framework for development" whose purpose should be an overview, ensuring a framework that protects the developability of all of the landholdings (MB1, MB2 and (as proposed) MB3 ie. the additional 24 ha.) involved. 20.Anything more elaborate (a masterplan as defined in PAN 83) is premature to a binding commitment of the landowners, if it is to resource and address transport impacts, delivery of a distributor, servicing (including foul drainage) and utilities, flood risk, surface water drainage and landscaping which policy prescribes. The Council has previously acknowledged these to involve considerable cost by dint of its previously approved funding commitment. That binding commitment was not able to be achieved. Conclusion 21.In relation to the Brahan Estate interest, the IMFLDP should allocate 8.2 ha. of land for housing MB2 with the scale of early development determined by spare capacity in infrastructure; a further 24 ha. for expansion subject to a suitable access to the A835; and in seeking to assimilation these lands with MB1 (including the Brahan Estate land as allocated) it should seek a "framework for development" and

acknowledge that that could be prepared by landowner/developers. Recommendation (1) Add “Mixed Use; MB3 Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; Requirements: subject to access (to the A835), a developer masterplan to include a landscape framework; access to be determined by Transport Assessment and in agreement with Transport Scotland”. Appropriate references (as the Council proposes at MB1) to core paths links, international conservation designations, flood risk and archaeology are not opposed. (2) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, including Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6: Ross-shire Growth Area. (3) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (as proposed at (1) above); to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for “early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity in infrastructure and services”. Documents Proposals Map: Proposed Adjustment Report by Director of Housing and Property and Minute

Allocated to	Maryburgh	General	General	
--------------	-----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04355	Name	Eilidh Green	Organisation	Maryburgh Community Council
-----------------	-------	------	--------------	--------------	-----------------------------

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

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

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

#### Comment Changes

MCC are disappointed that the area to the south of Maryburgh along Dunglass Road was removed from the original proposed IMFDP. Given the long term nature of this plan, we would like the council to reconsider and ask that it be reinstated as an area for future development.

#### Representation

We ask that the area be considered for mixed use, with preference given to MB1 and MB2 being developed ahead of this area.

Allocated to	Maryburgh	General	General	
--------------	-----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01680	Name	Mr Andrew Matheson	Organisation	Maryburgh Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	MB1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Allocation of a further 24 ha of land for residential and mixed use adjoining Maryburgh to the West and belonging to Brahan Estate.

Representation

The draft plan on which the consultation was based included an area on either side of the Dunglass Road to the south west of Maryburgh. The proposal to include this in the IMFLDP was welcomed by the Community Council and there were very few negative comments from anyone else. Plans for developing this area would commence as soon as it is zoned for housing development because it is in the single ownership of my family. The 2004 Ross & Cromarty East local development plan zoned an area to the north and west of Maryburgh for housing development subject to it being developed under a single master plan. Strenuous and lengthy negotiations have taken place to endeavour to agree on the drafting of a master plan. The 4 owners together with their advisors, the Highland Council, the Highland Small Communities Housing Trust, Albyn Housing and the Highland Housing Alliance were all involved and put in a huge amount of time and effort which ultimately failed. There seems no likelihood of reaching agreement in the future and the result is that only very a limited number of houses will be constructed until other land is zoned. Maryburgh has been starved of new housing for many years. There is a substantial desire within the community to expand and the only opportunity for a reasonable size of development with a healthy mix of different types of housing is now the area to the south west of the village. This area, which was generally approved of in the local consultation, should be reinstated in the IMFLDP in order to satisfy the demand within the community.

Allocated to	Maryburgh	General	General	
--------------	-----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00430	Name	Mr Ronnie MacRae	Organisation	Highland Small Communities Housing Trust
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	MB1 Maryburgh Exp Site North		Type	Support	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Representation

That a flexible approach is taken to road access to MB1, Maryburgh allowing for development of a smaller phase of housing development with access from Donald Cameron Court. Denser housing capacity should be provided on the lower side of MB1.

Allocated to	Maryburgh	MB1	Maryburgh Expansion site (North)	
--------------	-----------	-----	----------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04060	Name	Jennifer Ross	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	MB1		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

It is more a confirmation of procedures involved rather than an objection. My concerns relate to phases 1 and 2 of the proposed development. The considerable impact that an extra 200 homes would have on an already overloaded Ussie Burn is somewhat worrying. Being flooded twice in the past 7 years and coming close on a number of other occasions I seek some confirmation that adequate provision for additional drainage will be made. Also that the Ussie Burn maintenance will be taken into consideration from the outset of the building works. If this is overlooked my concern is that the entire lower Maryburgh will experience flooding to some extent as a direct result of the building works.

Representation

My reasons for clarification on this point are fairly self explanatory. As a concerned resident who has already experienced the devastating effect flood damage can have on your own home, to know that the problem is not entirely resolved at present should highlight my concern that building work will exacerbate a problem which has been merely laying dormant for the past few years. Again I stress that this is not an objection to the development per se, I am simply looking for some kind of confirmation that appropriate action will be taken to make formal provision for upkeep and/or upgrading of this area to enable suitable preventative action to be put in place, to prevent this from being a future concern.

Allocated to	Maryburgh	MB1	Maryburgh Expansion site (North)	
--------------	-----------	-----	----------------------------------	--

Customer Number04364NameKatharine RistOrganisationWoodland Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section4.Development AllocationsParagraph

ReferenceMB2TypeChangeComment LateNo

Comment Changes

Site sparsely wooded but entire site is AW and part of Broad Wood adjoining to S. AW already lost to housing on East of site. Site is appropriate for rehabilitation of AW. Opposed.

Representation

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

Allocated toMaryburghMB2Maryburgh Expansion site (South)

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reconsideration to be given to allocation for house building.

Representation

There have been numerous clinical studies carried out worldwide on the increased risk of paediatric leukaemia associated with living in close proximity to electricity pylons. There are two high voltage power lines running through MB2 with supporting pylons. It would be morally, and it could be argued if one were clinically qualified to pass comment from this perspective, irresponsible to deliberately expose minors to the increased risk of developing a childhood cancer. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/apr/28/health.science> <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/1202453.stm> <http://www.greenhealthwatch.com/newsstories/newsmobilephones/powerlines-double-leukaemia.html> <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-28385/Pylons-linked-leukaemia.html> <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-451238/Dont-build-schools-homes-near-pylons-warn-experts.html>

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reconsideration given to the actual site of proposed buildings.

Representation

There is a stream running through MB2 which would require to be “redirected” away from its natural course. The attendant disruption this would have on the immediate area would require a considerable amount of time to establish itself before any building plans could be drawn up.

Allocated to

Customer Number	01036	Name	Brahan Estate	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Administrator Yvonne Macdonald		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	MB2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

### Comment Changes

(1) MB2 should be Maryburgh Expansion Site (“West”). (2) MB2 “Housing Capacity” should be “approximately 95”. - and as referred in relation to the proposed allocation of a further 24 ha. of land at Brahan Estate; (1) Add “Mixed Use; as MB3 (ie. MU3 in MIR) Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; subject to access (to the A835) to be agreed with Transport Scotland and a developer masterplan”. (2) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6. (3) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (ie. MU3 as proposed at (1) above) to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for “early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity of infrastructure and services”.

### Representation

Grounds of Objection 1. This objection concerns the provisions made in the PLDP that affect the delivery of land at MB2; and that those “requirements” applied to MB1 are superimposed and are not clear. This representation should be read in conjunction with the representations lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate to the MIR (MU2/MU3) and with the planning authority’s response; and with a representation in relation to MB1 lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate. 2. The grounds of objection are that the PLDP presents an ineffective framework for expansion of Maryburgh; and that its contribution to a Growth Area economic development strategy and its development as a sustainable community is suppressed as result. Specifically that: • the allocation MB2 may be substantially dependent on an access distributor phased from the east; that is dependent in turn on land assembly that has not been achieved despite a recent initiative and the availability of public and agency funding to facilitate it; and thus the alternative strategy brought forward on behalf of Brahan Estate would help deliver of MB2; • that the potential for “early development on land MB2 (off Birch Drive) should be consistent with the capacity in infrastructure and services”; and; • that a framework to co-ordinate development of MB2 with adjacent allocations is required and that should be for preparation by developer/landowner interests, not exclusively by the Council. 3. The alternative strategy referred to above is proposed by Brahan Estate and set out in the corresponding representations to MB1. It would facilitate access to MB2 and MB1 from the west; and thus the phasing of development from two directions enabling access in the first instance to two of the three landholdings that comprise MB1, and ultimately enabling access to the third from the east and the west. That is a substantive improvement on the circumstances the PLDP promotes and would deliver all of MB2 without the need for an 800m distributor road. 4. The land MB2 and the westernmost 1.0 ha. of MB1 is owned by Brahan Estate. The Estate wishes that the allocation of its interests is confirmed within the development plan. 5. The policy must recognise in principle that development of MB2 (in part) should proceed in accordance with available capacity in infrastructure and services; and it is that which should determine the scale of development and the extent to which it might be “limited”. 6. The provisions for MB2 are not interchangeable with MB1. It is assumed that 200 houses is not allocated at MB2. The expectation that 17 ha. of land would accommodate 200 houses on MB1 would give a density factor of 11 homes per ha.; applying that pro-rata to MB2 would give a capacity for MB2 of some 95 houses. Whatever is meant under MB1 by “limited housing development”, a brake on development that frustrates a greater proportion of that capacity would represent a considerable loss of housing to Maryburgh. 7. That is underscored by the terms in which MB2 (as expressed in the PLDP) would develop. In that regard, MB2 as configured in policy, would be substantially dependent on phasing MB1 from the east and the provision in that context of a distributor road of some 800m in length. MB1 cannot be opened up at all from the east without the first 100m of a new distributor road. By comparison, the distance between MB2 and the A835 would be less than half of that distance. 8. The inability of an agency initiative with public funding less than four years ago to assemble the land in three ownerships and thus enable development of MB1, has serious implications for delivering the substantive part of MB1 and MB2; and a clear risk that expansion of Maryburgh and the objectives of the development plan will be stymied. 9. The Council is obliged to act in a proactive way to resolve those circumstances. That is the purpose of the development plan. It can do so compliant with Scottish Planning Policy 2010, by allocating a further 24 ha. of land within the Brahan Estate ownership, enabling proper and full investigation of access to the A835 such that an effective land bank - including the land which it wishes to promote and which would otherwise be constrained - is able to be made fully effective. That scenario would not involve land assembly nor would it involve 800m of distributor access required to open up the substantive parts of the Brahan Estate allocation in MB1 or MB2. 10. These matters and the relevant policy implications are set out in the corresponding representation to MB1 lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate. As they have implications for MB2, they are referred to below also as



recommendations in relation to MB2. Recommendation (1) MB2 is mistakenly referred as Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) whereas it should be Maryburgh Expansion Site (West). (2) The PDL is not clear as to the capacity of MB2. Applying a pro-rata calculation based on MB1 (200 homes) would give approximately 95 homes. That capacity should be applied specifically to MB2. - and as referred in relation to the proposed allocation of a further 24 ha. of land at Brahan Estate; (3) Add “Mixed Use; MB3 Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; Requirements: subject to access (to the A835), a developer masterplan to include a landscape framework; access to be determined by Transport Assessment and in agreement with Transport Scotland”. Appropriate references (as the Council proposes at MB1) to core paths links, international conservation designations, flood risk and archaeology are not opposed. (4) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, including Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6: Ross-shire Growth Area. (5) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (as proposed at (1) above); to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for “early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity in infrastructure and services”. Documents Main Issues Report Representation on behalf of Brahan Estate

Allocated to	Maryburgh	MB2	Maryburgh Expansion site (South)	
--------------	-----------	-----	----------------------------------	--