

THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL

**SOUTH PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE –
08 APRIL 2014**

Agenda Item	6.1
Report No	PLS/020/14

**13/03825/FUL: The Highland Council
Land to the east and west of the River Ness and Caledonian Canal.**

Report by Head of Planning and Building Standards

SUMMARY

Description: The proposal is the Inverness West Link Road; the key aspects of which involve the construction of 3.2km of new single carriageway road with 5 roundabouts, a swing bridge over the Caledonian Canal and new bridge over the River Ness. The application includes details of the associated drainage, earthworks, fencing, landscaping, associated new access tracks/paths and street lighting.

Recommendation: **GRANT** planning permission.

Wards: 14 – Inverness West and 16 – Inverness Ness-side

Development category: Local

Pre-determination hearing: None

Reason referred to Committee: More than 5 objections

1.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 1.1 This application relates to the final phase of the Inverness Southern Distributor Road (SDR), known as the Inverness West Link, which will allow completion of the City's peripheral neighbourhoods without an unacceptable impact on City centre congestion.
- 1.2 The proposed road runs from the SDR at Holm roundabout on Dores Road to the A82(T) on both sides of the canal. The route follows the river bank from the existing Holm roundabout to a fixed bridge crossing over the River Ness at the Precast Concrete works/River Ness Weir. The road then follows the toe of the Caledonian Canal embankment to a tandem canal swing bridge arrangement at Tomnahurich as well as continuing on to link to Glenurquhart Road to the east side of the canal. General Booth Road will be realigned to meet with a new roundabout proposed on the A82(T) to the west of the canal.

- 1.3 The proposal involves the construction of 3.2km of new single carriageway road with 5 roundabouts, a swing bridge over the Caledonian Canal and new bridge over the River Ness. The road will be designed in a similar fashion to the existing SDR, comprising a 7.3m wide single carriageway road with a 3.0m wide shared use footway/cycleway on each side, including a 0.5m wide separation strip. Generally there are 10m lighting columns at 40m centres throughout and 1.05m high post and wire fences on the road boundary. On each roundabout arm there are uncontrolled pedestrian crossings via traffic separation islands.
- 1.4 The development, which will be built in two phases – or Stages, is best described in more detail if broken down into six distinct sections as follows:

Stage 1

Holm Roundabout – Mill Lade Roundabout

From Holm roundabout the road heads west towards Ness-side on 1m high embankments. Lighting columns and a 1m deep ditch will be located on the northern side of the road. The road connects to a new 4-arm roundabout at Ness-side with connections to Ness-side Farm and future allocated development land. The roundabout will have a 10m high lighting column at its centre and 10m high columns around the outer edge. A road sign (2.2 x 3.2m mounted 1.8m above ground) is to be provided on each approach to the roundabout. The connecting road to Ness-side will have 8m high lighting columns.

From the Ness-side roundabout, the road heads north towards the river bank and then north-east running parallel with the river. This section is again on 1m high embankments and has a 1m deep ditch on the eastern side. The road is set back from the river bank by 40m. Approximately half way along this section, there is a vehicle lay-by that links to existing and proposed footpaths.

On the approach to the Precast Concrete works a SUDS road drainage infiltration basin will be created between the road and the river. The road is on embankment through the Precast Concrete Yard rising to approximately 3.5m above ground level as it connects to a new 4-arm roundabout at Mill Lade with connections to future allocated development land. Lighting columns will be provided on the eastern side of the road with a 10m high column in the roundabout centre. Again there will be road signs on each approach to the roundabout.

New Bridge over Ness

From the Mill Lade roundabout, the road turns north to cross the Mill Lade, River Ness and Electric Burn with a 3 span bridge. The design of the bridge will not be dissimilar to the existing Ness Bridge within the City centre, albeit it will be constructed of steel beams with a concrete deck on concrete piers. It will have parapet vehicle containment railings.

There are step and ramp links to paths on either side of the bridge as well as a ramp to connect to the Caledonian Canal towpath. Lighting on the bridge is via low level lighting within the height of the parapet.

Canal Park – Queen’s Park Roundabout

The road turns north east and runs at approximately ground level adjacent to the toe of the Caledonian Canal through Canal Parks and past the rugby pitches. A road drainage infiltration basin is provided at the north east corner of the bridge in Canal Park. Sports netting up to 10m high is provided adjacent to the rugby pitches.

The road then rises up to approximately 6m above ground level to connect to a new 3-arm roundabout at Queens Park. Lighting columns will be provided on the eastern side of the road with a 10m high lighting column in the centre of the roundabout. Two underpasses are provided under the road at this location. Steps and a ramp footpath/cycle link will be provided to the underpasses, canal towpath and Inverness Leisure.

Connecting footpaths will be illuminated with 5m high lighting columns at approximately 20m spacing. Underpasses will be illuminated and have provision for CCTV monitoring. Road signs, 1.8m above ground level, are to be located on each approach to the roundabout.

Queen’s Park Roundabout – Glenurquhart Road

From the roundabout at Canal Park, the link drops down to nominal ground level to provide a new 3-arm roundabout at Tomnahurich to link to the existing A82(T). Lighting columns are provided on the western side of the road at approximately 35m centres. A 10m high lighting column will be located in the centre of the Tomnahurich roundabout. 1.8m high road signs will be provided at approaches to the roundabout.

From this roundabout, short links are provided to the existing Tomnahurich Swing Bridge and to the A82(T) junction with Bught Drive. The junction at Bught Drive will be remodelled to segregate turning movements with the addition of a traffic island with uncontrolled pedestrian crossings.

Stage 2

Queen’s Park Roundabout – Torvean Roundabout

The road crosses the Caledonian Canal at a new swing bridge and connects to a new 4-arm roundabout at Torvean. The road is on a 1m high embankment with a 1m deep ditch along its northern side. There are links to existing paths emerging at the canal towpath as well as a vehicle junction to serve the proposed location for the relocated Jacobite Cruises. The swing bridge will be of similar design to the one that exists to the north.

A SUDS road drainage infiltration basin and bridge control building is provided within the triangle formed between this link, the existing A82(T) and the canal. Lighting columns will be provided on the northern side of the road with a 10m high column at the centre of the roundabout.

Torvean Roundabout and General Booth Road

A northern link is provided to a realigned General Booth Road at its junction with the new A82(T) Torvean Roundabout. The northern link has a ditch along its western side, two bus laybys and 10m high lighting columns at approximately 26-40m spacing. 1.8m high traffic signs are provided on the roundabout approaches from the west and north.

A new underpass is provided on the western link with ramps linking from the roundabout to General Booth Road. Connecting ramps will be illuminated with 5m high lighting columns at approximately 20m spacing. The underpass will be illuminated and will have provision for CCTV monitoring.

A new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing is provided on the eastern link near the existing Tomnahurich Swing Bridge as part of the Great Glen Way diversion.

Advance and local traffic warning signs will advise motorists on each approach to the canal bridges which link to use when one of the tandem canal bridges is closed to road traffic.

- 1.5 The proposal, while referred to as a 'link' road, is not designed nor has it been promoted as a City bypass. The road's primary purpose is to provide for more efficient distribution of traffic movement across the City. It provides additional routes and capacity for vehicular and active travel crossings of the River Ness and the canal where opportunities for such links are currently limited.
- 1.6 As a consequence of the road alignment Stage 1 would involve the loss of one sports pitch at Canal Park and an area leased to Inverness Blitz at Queen's Park that will be relocated to Bught Park. Two of the three existing rugby pitches at Canal Park will be re-positioned and one regarded along with other alterations to the rugby club facilities.
- 1.7 While this application specifically relates to the road, the wider project includes proposals to relocate Torvean Golf Course to the north of the A82(T), including clubhouse and practice facilities, and provide four new pitches at a new Sports Hub located to the east of a realigned General Booth Road. Completion of the repositioning of the golf course would not be required until Stage 2. New berthing facilities, two concrete jetties and four pontoons, for the canal craft to lay-over when the bridge is closed, are to be provided on the west bank of the canal. The existing Jacobite Cruises building will be replaced with a new building with associated car park and bus park/turning area. Again these would not be required until Stage 2.
- 1.8 In addition to the new accommodation works building for Jacobite Cruises, two further buildings will be required; a new control building for both swing bridges and a small plant building associated with the bridge.
- 1.9 The application is Environmental Impact Assessment development and is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES).

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site falls within two distinct site characters split by the River Ness. The first is a strip of arable farmland that runs parallel with and to the south-eastern side of the River Ness. There is evidence of industrial heritage within this side of the river with the existence of a former wood mill/pre-cast concrete works as well as the Pringle Holm Mills complex and crofting/farming use. The second, on the west side of the river, lies within land currently used for recreational purposes; namely rugby pitches, the canal and golf course.
- 2.2 The site lies wholly within the catchment of the River Ness.
- 2.3 There are no natural heritage designations covering the site. However, Torvean Landforms Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) lies very close to the proposed scheme (within 60m). This geomorphological feature contains a range of fluvioglacial landforms (deposited by meltwater) comprising kame terraces, eskers and kettleholes.
- 2.4 The River Moriston Special Area of Conservation (SAC), designated for its Atlantic Salmon and Fresh Water Pearl interest, lies 35 kilometres west of the development site. Although the River Ness is not connected to this SAC, the interest features pass through the scheme.
- 2.5 The development site is not covered by any international, national, regional or local landscape designation. The site lies within the *Suburban Fringe* and *River Ness and Canal* Landscape Character Types (LCTs) identified in the Inverness District Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (SNH, 1999).
- 2.6 There are three Scheduled Ancient Monuments relevant to the development:
- Caledonian Canal (SM-6499)
 - Torvean Motte (SM-3806)
 - Holme Mains Motte (SM-3078)
- 2.7 A further 12 sites of archaeological interest within or near to the study area have been identified. These include locations where there were isolated archaeological finds, burial cists and crop marks.
- 2.8 The Firs, 2 Dores Road and Drummond Tower, Stratherrick Road, situated 450m and 650m from the bridge crossing respectively, are both Category B listed buildings. The Inverness Riverside Conservation Areas lies directly to the south and east of the proposed road. Tomnahurich Cemetery, adjacent to the north of the development, is listed in the national Inventory of Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes.
- 2.9 Nearest noise sensitive properties are:
- Residential property Ness Side Lodge (80m)
 - Residential property at 8 Holm Mills Road (180m)
 - Hotel, Caravan Park and housing to north of existing A82(T) (30m)

3.0 BACKGROUND/PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The SDR has been identified in successive development plans since the 1980's. Phases 1 – 4, Inshes to Holm Roundabout, were completed between 1985 and 2002 and distribute traffic around the city that primarily arise from the City's southern neighbourhoods. The Council committed to Phase 5, the subject of this application, in 2003.
- 3.2 By 2005/6, in order to attract Scottish Government funding, the SDR was repackaged as a strategic trunk road link between the A9(T) and A82(T) with two links, one of which is the West Link as proposed. However, following a Strategic Transport Project Review (STPR) undertaken between 2007 and 2008 it was clear that the road would not be funded and built by Transport Scotland as a Trunk Road. It was considered that the route should be a distributor road serving local traffic and would require to be funded by the Council in much the same way as the SDR Phases 1 – 4 had been delivered.
- 3.3 In deciding on how to provide the West Link, five options were initially considered. Following feedback from the first public consultation exercise undertaken in December 2010 a further three options were included to take forward to the second stage of design development. As part of the second stage options appraisal process public consultation was undertaken in November/December 2011 on all eight options. The options, in summary, were:
- Option 1 – Essentially the same as the current proposal but with the addition of a short link from Dores Rd to Mill Lade Roundabout.
 - Option 2 – As above but with canal crossing further south.
 - Option 3 – Short link from Dores Road to Whin Park and Bught Road then as proposed.
 - Option 4 – As above but with canal crossing further south.
 - Option 5 – As above but with canal crossing further south still.
 - Option 6 – As proposed.
 - Option 7 – High level bridge from Holm Roundabout over the River Ness and Canal to A82(T) and tandem swing bridge as proposed.
 - Option 8 – Short link from Dores Road to Canal Park then through Canal Park to a tunnel under canal and link to Bught Road
- 3.4 Having taken into consideration the results of the public consultation and reviewed the feasibility of the options further, the Council, at its meeting on 01 March 2012, adopted Option 6 as the preferred option to be taken forward to Stage III of the design development.
- 3.5 03.07.2012 – EIA Scoping Opinion issued.
- 3.6 08.01.2014 – Application for planning permission in principle submitted for a mixed use development consisting of (1) an 18 hole golf course, practice area, and new golf club house, (2) the formation of a 'Sports Hub' comprising sports pitches, fitness trails, car parking, and building to accommodate changing/shower facilities, (3) an extension to the existing Kilvean Cemetery, (4) Parkland areas, and ancillary works, all on land at Torvean, Inverness (14/00049/PIP).

3.7 18.03.2014 – Scheduled Monument Consent issued by Historic Scotland for the Inverness West Link.

4.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4.1 22.04.2013: Proposal of Application Notice submitted (13/01542/PAN).

While there is no statutory duty to undertake pre-application consultation on a local development this application has been progressed using the same consultation procedures as if it were a planning application for Major development. Public exhibitions took place on 17 and 18 April and 04 May 2013.

4.2 Advertised: 18 October 2013 in the Inverness Courier and Edinburgh Gazette and again on 17 January 2014 on receipt of the Addendum.

Representation deadline: 16 February 2014

Timeous representations against:	431
Comments:	0
Representations in support:	1

4.3 Material considerations raised against the proposal are summarised as follows:

- Adverse impact on green and 'scenic' open space
- Detrimental effect on the setting, tranquillity and amenity of the river/canal/open space
- Adverse effect on leisure/recreational areas of Whin Park, Torvean Golf Club, Highland Rugby Football Club and Inverness Rowing Club
- Cost to loss of recreational areas not fully assessed
- Will be built on functional flood plain
- Adverse impact on flora and fauna
- Increased traffic noise
- Increased traffic pollution/decrease air quality – specific comment on road should be located further out
- Increased light pollution
- Lack of need
- Not effective in reducing traffic congestion i.e. swing bridge and traffic lights
- Proposal not effective at distributing traffic – specific comments on design (length of route/roundabouts) and double swing bridge
- Poor design
- Result in increased mortality on roads
- Obstruction to the canal for canal users
- Restrict the activities of the Inverness Rowing Club, by introducing new structures, reducing accessibility to the club's boat house, parking and loading space as well as the available water space all to the detriment of a flourishing and successful sport
- Impact on landowner interests (including crofting) and ability to develop land

4.4 Material considerations raised in support of the proposal are summarised as follows:

- Bridge over river in appropriate place to preserve riverside landscape
- Will have minimal impact on recreational areas
- Canal swing bridge an elegant solution that will reduce need for closure
- Will enable continuous flow of trunk road traffic

4.5 Other matters raised against the proposal that are not material are summarised as:

- Wrong option chosen – high level bridge or tunnel preferred
- No proper consultation – not a transparent process
- Costs of tunnel option not fully detailed for comparison to be made
- Not what public want – will only suit developers
- Waste of money

4.6 It is considered that a number of issues raised relate to the principles and alternative options to the current proposed road that is the subject of this planning application. These matters have been considered in several reports to various committees of the Council, including the City of Inverness Area committee on 12 August 2013 and full Council on 5 September 2013 following the third round of public consultation.

4.7 Of the 430 representations received against the proposal, 189 were pro-forma comments made in respect of the costs of a tunnel option. 66 were pro-forma comments regarding the impact on Inverness Rowing Club. The remaining 176 were individual representations.

4.8 A list of all those who made representation is provided in Appendix 1 of this report. All letters of representation can be viewed via the Council's e-planning portal <http://wam.highland.gov.uk>.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Ballifeary Community Council objects to the proposal on the basis that:

- footways are generally shared use cycleway/footway design rather than segregated;
- vehicular access to the Floral Hall will be less direct having instead to go through Bught Drive, Avenue and Road;
- there will be significant loss of mature trees; and,
- loss of an area of peace and tranquillity currently enjoyed by walkers, dog walkers, runners, tourists and cyclists.

5.2 Holm Community Council: No response received.

5.3 Inverness West Community Council: No response received.

5.4 Lochardil and Drummond Community Council object on the basis that:

- the scheme is effectively a repeat of the SDR, which is not considered a good model for walkers and cyclists, with cyclists having to dismount at each roundabout and walkers being in close proximity to the road. A separate cycling lane and segregated footpath is desirable;
- parking should be provided near the Mill Lade Roundabout to allow people to walk and reduce congestion;
- there will be a loss of significant number of mature trees;
- a green strip along the road could act as noise mitigation; and
- the path along the Ness should be protected.

The Community Council highlight that some members expressed concern over the lack of transparency over selection of Option 6.

5.5 Inverness South Community Council: No response received.

5.6 Dalneigh Community Council: No response received.

5.7 Muirtown Community Council: No response received.

5.8 TEC Services (Roads and Transportation): recommend that suitable measures are put in place for post construction monitoring of both motorised and non motorised user traffic, in order to check that scheme objectives in relation to traffic congestion and the expansion of active travel and public transport are met.

It is also recommended that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is established for each construction phase of the project and prepared in consultation with the Highland Council Area Roads and Community Works Manager, Transport Scotland, the Police, community representatives and representatives of the various facilities directly affected by the works.

5.9 TEC Services (Flood Team): No objection subject to conditions relating to details on drainage ponds and roadside ditches and the need for an operation and maintenance manual.

5.10 TEC Services (Environmental Health) has provided advice on both the construction and operational impacts of the proposed development and has no objection.

TEC Services (Environmental Health) considers that the effects during construction, including noise, vibration, traffic impact and air quality, will require mitigation. Conditions requiring vibration, dust and noise management plans are suggested. In addition, a condition controlling the type and timing of piling operations is requested.

From an operational perspective TEC Services (Environmental Health) considers that securing the physical mitigation outlined within Volume 2 plans, Series 35 plans 1 – 4 and Appendix 1.4 of the ES is highlighted as is the need for post completion monitoring to ascertain whether any further mitigation in the form of traffic calming is required. It does not consider there to be a need for any

mitigation regarding air quality.

Reference is made to the need to undertake further assessment of some properties to ascertain whether assistance will be required with protecting properties from noise through insulation grants, the criteria for which is regulated by the Noise Insulation (Scotland) Regulations 1975.

- 5.11 TEC Services (Environmental Health – Contaminated Land) advise that records indicate that parts of the site have historic uses that may have resulted in land contamination but that the development would not appear to materially change the risk of potential contamination. An informative on any decision notice is suggested to inform the applicant of the potential issues.
- 5.12 Council's Historic Environment Team advise that the development lies within an area where there is potential for buried archaeological remains. Further archaeological monitoring is required along the length of the route of the route to the south of the River Ness, along with monitoring any works to the Canal, and recording of the Holm Mills and Bught Mill Lades.
- 5.13 Council Forestry Officer advises that the impact on existing trees/woodland has been minimised as far as possible. Tree and woodland impact is accepted as necessary but will have a high impact in certain locations, particularly at the new bridge crossing and adjacent to the stadium. These areas contain larger, mature trees and the impact will be more pronounced.

Advice is that mitigation for required tree removals is critical. In broad terms the landscape proposals are acceptable for most areas, but it is considered that additional tree planting treatments should be provided in certain additional locations such as the area to the north-east of the sports pitches and alongside the road running south from the river crossing to the Dores Road/ Ness-side roundabout.

No objection subject to conditions relating to tree protection, supervision and further landscaping/planting.

- 5.14 Council Access Officer recommends conditions to be attached to any permission given to ensure that the development complies with access legislation and Council policy.
- 5.15 Scottish Water: No objection.
- 5.16 Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) has no objection to the proposal subject to a condition requiring a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- 5.17 Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) advice is that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on any qualifying interests of the River Moriston SAC either directly or indirectly. It advises that there will be no impact on great crested newts. With regard to bats, SNH advise that discussion on the need for a licence should be discussed as an early stage.

Subject to the mitigation suggested, including the need for a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), SNH has no objection.

- 5.18 JMP on behalf of Transport Scotland (Trunk Roads and Bus Operations) notes that the proposal does not act as a bypass of Inverness for trunk road traffic and there is no significant movement of traffic between A9(T) and A82(T) or between the A96(T) and the A82(T) which is in line with Transport Scotland's view that the route should be regarded as a distributor road for local traffic rather than part of a strategic bypass for trunk road traffic.

With regard to pedestrian/cyclist effects, advice is that clear, safe and secure routes will be required to ensure that non-motorised users can access the network of footways during construction. This can be achieved by a Traffic Management Plan which takes into account these users. During operation, no significant impact will result.

With regard to vehicle travellers, advice is that there will be little effect during construction subject to careful construction programming. Although there will be adverse effects for public transport users due to the removal of existing bus stops temporary bus stops will be provided. The conclusion that effects during operation are likely to be slight/beneficial is accepted.

Subject to conditions requiring a Construction Stage Traffic Management Plan and details of the proposed crossing on the A82(T) east of Tomnahurich Roundabout to be agreed in advance of work, Transport Scotland is satisfied with the ES and raise no objection.

- 5.19 Historic Scotland accepts the identified need and consequential wider public benefits of a new road crossing of the canal which justifies a degree of impact on the Caledonian Canal Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). It advises that the proposal as it relates to its historic environment interests has been properly considered and appropriate mitigation has been recommended to minimise impacts on both the site and setting of the canal. As such Historic Scotland offers no objection to the proposal. It advises that an application for SAM Consent will be required and that this advice does not prejudice any such future application.

- 5.20 SportScotland request that conditions are placed on any permission granted to ensure that the pitches at Canal Park will be re-provided to an acceptable standard, protected during construction and that ball stop fencing will be provided.

With regard to Inverness Blitz facility at Queens Park SportScotland feel that, although re-located to the Bught, this is not necessarily compensation but understand that any betterment is tied in with proposals for the Sports Hub.

Advice with regard to the effect on Torvean Golf Course is that any permission should be subject to conditions to ensure that the course is appropriately designed and constructed and protected from construction activity.

SportScotland has highlighted concern relating to the ability for Inverness Rowing Club to continue to use its existing facilities without further consideration of the

proposed pontoons and jetties and access to its clubhouse. Although it does not object, SportScotland advise that the current proposal does not satisfy the requirements of the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief in this regard.

- 5.21 Scottish Canals has indicated that it is “*fully supportive of the West Link proposal as it has been presented.*” While, considering that the proposed design for the new swing bridge and control building is acceptable in its current form, Scottish Canals see an opportunity to raise the quality of the design and encourages the Council to run a design competition to this end. Such an event it is considered could run concurrently and in support of a new Scottish Canals initiative to improve the design of canal infrastructure within the area.

Scottish Canals ask that access to its property, Tomnahurich Cottage, which is currently used as a holiday let, and the adjacent towpath is maintained and that landscaping proposals in the area are of the highest quality in order to protect the setting of the cottage. Further details of the landscaping treatment, particularly adjacent to the canal and the road-locked section of the canal between the swing bridges are requested.

Opportunities to further consider enhancing amenity and improving overall pedestrian safety around the Tomnahurich part of the canal has been identified by Scottish Canals who consider other new initiatives such as the Scottish Government’s Scenic Routes Project should be utilised to test further design and landscape enhancements.

Scottish Canals continue to support use of the canal at this location by the Inverness Rowing Club. It states that “*[We] recognise the valued activity of the Rowing Club and what this brings to the canal, particularly in the quieter winter months when there is limited activity on the water. Scottish Canals firmly believe that, with appropriate adjustment to the moorings infrastructure, and operation of the new bridge during regattas as agreed by Transport Scotland, we can continue to offer this fantastic 5k stretch of rowing water on the Caledonian Canal.*”

6.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICY

- 6.1 The following policies are relevant to the assessment of the application:

Highland Wide Local Development Plan (April 2012)

Policy 8	Ness-side and Charleston
Policy 28	Sustainable Development
Policy 29	Design, Quality and Place Making
Policy 30	Physical Constraints
Policy 34	Settlement Development Areas
Policy 43	Tourism
Policy 51	Trees and Development
Policy 52	Principle of Development in Woodland
Policy 55	Peat and Soils
Policy 56	Travel
Policy 57	Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage
Policy 58	Protected Species

Policy 59	Other Important Species
Policy 60	Other Important Habitats
Policy 61	Landscape
Policy 63	Water Environment
Policy 64	Flood Risk
Policy 66	Surface Water Drainage
Policy 70	Waste Management Facilities
Policy 72	Pollution
Policy 73	Air Quality
Policy 74	Green Networks
Policy 75	Open Space
Policy 76	Playing Fields and Sports Pitches
Policy 77	Public Access
Policy 78	Long Distance Routes

Inverness Local Plan 2006 (as continued in force)

6.2 The majority of the general policies and land allocations of the Local Plan applicable to this application have been superseded by the policies of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. However a number of land allocations/proposals still remain in force. These include:

- Policy 8(ii) Torvean
- Policy 24 Bught
- Policy 29 A9 – A82 Trunk Road Link
- Policy 41(ii) Green Wedges – Torvean / Muirtown
- Policy 43 Golf Course – Charleston
- Policy 46 Badger Survey

Supplementary Guidance

6.3 The following statutory supplementary guidance is relevant to the assessment of the application:

- Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief
- Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment
- Green Networks
- Highland Historic Environment Strategy
- Physical Constraints
- Trees, Woodlands and Development

7.0 OTHER MATERIAL PLANNING POLICY

Proposed Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

7.1 The following policy is material to the assessment of the application:

- Policy IN24 Torvean and Ness-side

Scottish Government Planning Policy and Guidance

7.2 The following Scottish Government policy and guidance is material to the assessment of this application:

- National Planning Framework for Scotland 2 (NPF2)
 - Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)
 - PAN 44 – Fitting New Development into the Landscape
 - PAN 60 – Planning for Natural Heritage
 - PAN 61 – Planning and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
 - PAN 65 – Planning and Open Space
 - PAN 69 – Planning and Building Standards Advice on Flooding
 - PAN 75 – Planning for Transport
 - PAN 1/2011 – Planning and Noise
 - PAN 2/2011 – Planning and Archaeology
 - PAN 1/2013 – Environmental Impact Assessment
-
- Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP)

8.0 PLANNING APPRAISAL

8.1 Section 25 and of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan in this case comprises the Highland wide Local Development Plan (approved April 2012), the Inverness Local Plan 2006 (as continued in force), and all associated statutorily adopted Supplementary Guidance.

Determining Issues

8.2 The determining issues are:

- do the proposals accord with the development plan?
- if they do accord, are there any compelling reasons for not approving them?
- if they do not accord, are there any compelling reasons for approving them?

Planning Considerations

8.3 In order to address the determining issues, the Committee must consider the extent to which the proposal:

- a) complies with development plan policy in principle;
- b) is compatible with national and other planning policy;
- c) will impact on built and cultural heritage;
- d) will impact on natural heritage;
- e) will impact on trees, woodland and farming;
- f) will impact on sporting, recreational and access assets in the area;
- g) promotes quality design without adverse impact on landscape/visual amenity;
- h) will impact on transport users – vehicular and non-vehicular;

- i) will impact upon drainage and flooding;
- j) will mitigate impacts during construction;
- k) will mitigate impacts on amenity during operation;
- l) needs to address any other material consideration.

Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance

- 8.4 The Development Plan comprises the Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP), the Inverness Local Plan (as continued in force), and all associated statutorily adopted Supplementary Guidance.
- 8.5 The Highland-wide Local Development Plan sets out a Spatial Strategy for completing the peripheral expansion areas of the City of Inverness. In this strategy, the Ness-side and Charleston areas are identified as 'Future Expansion Sites' dependent on construction of the final phase of the SDR – West Link. Turning specifically to land allocations, Policy 8 – Ness-side and Charleston of the HwLDP sets out support for a master plan approach to development of the area that will be taken forward in tandem with work to identify options for the river and canal crossings.
- 8.6 It is the acceptability of the chosen option that is the most frequently cited reason within public objection to the proposal. However, it is clear that a number of options were considered by the Council over several decades and more recently during a series of stakeholder events undertaken during 2010 – 2012, and that in coming to a final decision the views of the public were taken into consideration. The chosen option, and the one presented here, was subject to a formal STAG appraisal and received approval from the Council in March 2012. While alternatives are considered in the context of the Environmental Statement (ES) the planning authority is duty bound to consider only the proposal in front of it and therefore it is not appropriate to debate the merit or otherwise of other options here.
- 8.7 The Inverness Local Plan (as continued in force) provides a more defined policy context for the proposal. The broad corridor of the application route is identified on the City of Inverness Inset Map contained within the Local Plan and Policy 29 refers to the need to safeguard land along this alignment for such a link. Policy 29 requires the proposal to be designed in such a way as to minimise environmental impact on landscape, open space and recreational activities towards the Bught. Provision is made within the Plan for displaced recreational uses to be relocated within Council land at Torvean.
- 8.8 The masterplan approach referred to with regard to the HwLDP Policy 8, referred to above, resulted in the production and subsequent statutory adoption of the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief in November 2013. The Inner Moray Firth Proposed Plan supports development that progresses in accordance with this Brief. While the primary purpose of this is to provide a development framework, the brief makes specific reference to the West Link, in the line currently proposed, as the key enabling factor for development to take place within this part of the City.

- 8.9 The Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief recognises the need for all proposals that come forward to respect existing features of cultural and historic significance, safeguard and enhance green network features, and safeguard the water environment. Recognition is given to the need to consider the phasing of development to allow for reconfigured sporting uses in the area. Those relevant to this application are:
- Phase 1 – Reconfiguration of the pitches at Canal Park and relocation of Inverness Blitz to Bught Park to be completed prior to the commencement of Stage 1 of the West Link;
 - Phase 2 – Reconfiguration of the substantial part of the golf course to be completed prior to construction of Stage 2 of the West Link Road;
 - Phase 3 – Delivery of the Sports Hub and parkland to be delivered once all the reconfigured golf course is playable.
- 8.10 The development plan and supplementary guidance supports the principle of this development and the chosen alignment. Providing that the impacts of the development are not considered to be **significantly detrimental**, particularly in relation to issues of flooding and drainage, natural heritage, woodland, access and recreation, visual impact and amenity generally in the locality of the site, which will be considered in more detail below, the proposals would comply with the Development Plan including its associated Supplementary Guidance.

National and Other Planning Policy

- 8.11 The Inner Moray Firth Proposed Plan is a significant material consideration. As indicated above, along with the HwLDP and the Inverness Local Plan which it will replace, this Plan provides strong support for City expansion at Ness-side – Charleston which is predicated on the provision of the West Link. Providing that development accords with the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief as outlined above, it would be considered to comply with the Proposed Plan.
- 8.12 The proposal is not included within the National Planning Framework (NPF2) as a strategic transport priority, the focus of which in a Highland context at least is the need to strengthen links between Inverness – Perth and Aberdeen and Fort William – Glasgow. It is not proposed to form a strategic trunk road link. It will however provide for enhanced connectivity with a potential to reduce congestion within the City, a desirable factor identified within NPF2.
- 8.13 As with NPF2, SPP seeks to create a policy framework for sustainable economic development. SPP contains a number of subject specific policies, the following of which are relevant to this proposal; landscape and natural heritage, historic environment, open space and physical activity, transport, flooding and drainage.
- 8.14 SPP recognises that the relationship between transport and land use has a strong influence on sustainable economic growth. The development plan has recognised this, with the proposed road scheme identified as critical to an appropriately phased development of the Ness-side and Charleston areas of the City. In addition, the development plan recognises the need for development to progress taking into account the impact upon built and cultural heritage, the water

environment, the landscape and recreational interests within the area. With regard to the latter, SPP advises against the redevelopment of playing fields and sports pitches unless they can be upgraded to provide a better quality facility or are replaced with facilities of comparable or greater benefit for sport in a convenient location for users. This too is inherent within the wording of development plan policy.

- 8.15 A number of topic based guidance documents are produced by Scottish Government, the aim of which is to provide advice and guidance on how to manage development in such a way as to protect amenity and the built and natural environment and improve health and wellbeing through promotion of access and recreation.
- 8.16 On the basis that the impacts of the proposed development do not have a significant impact upon drainage and flooding, the landscape resource, built and cultural heritage, and open space and recreation within the area then the development would also be seen to be compatible with Scottish Government policy and guidance.

Built and Cultural Heritage

- 8.17 The area in which the proposal is located did not form part of the Burgh of Inverness until as recently as 1904. Although prior to this very rural in nature, the area has an interesting history and contains features of historical importance. Evidence of human influence in the area exists from as early as the Iron Age (fort at Torvean Hill), extending through to medieval times (Bught Mill), the Industrial Revolution (Holm Mills) and the advent of the modern era (Bught Power Station).
- 8.18 The most significant feature, at least in the context of this application, is arguably the Caledonian Canal which the proposed road will cross. Built in the earlier part of the nineteenth century, the Caledonian Canal was designed by Thomas Telford as a route for shipping that avoided having to sail around the north coast of Scotland. The Caledonian Canal, and the majority of its infrastructure, including the 1936 Tomnahurich Swing Bridge and control box, is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and therefore of national importance.
- 8.19 The proposal, both during construction and operation, will have a direct and significant impact upon the monument and its setting by virtue of the crossing itself and visibility of the road from the canal towpath. Mitigation is proposed, including minimising land take and ensuring appropriate landscaping, but nonetheless the residual impact will remain significant. Historic Scotland does not however object to the scheme and Scheduled Monument Consent has recently been granted.
- 8.20 Predicted effects on the other Scheduled Monuments identified within the study area are assessed by the applicant as not significant. Given that there will be no direct effects on these features, and that there is either no or limited visibility of the scheme from these receptors, this is considered a reasonable conclusion.
- 8.21 With regard to other archaeology, the additional twelve sites identified provide evidence of a long history of human activity in the area with many of the finds

discovered during the construction of the Caledonian Canal and other works within the Bught/Tomnahurich area. Even where features still exist, the proposal will have no direct impact. What the evidence does indicate however is that there remains potential for buried archaeological remains. The Council's Historic Environment Team advice is that further archaeological monitoring is required. This can be secured by condition.

- 8.22 While there are a number of historically important buildings within the vicinity of the proposal, including the Torvean Golf Course Clubhouse (former Smithy), the Bridge Keepers Cottage and Loch Ness House (now a hotel) around Tomnahurich, no listed buildings will be directly affected by the proposal and there will be no adverse impact upon the setting of any listed buildings.
- 8.23 The road, and crossing, while not within the Inverness Riverside Conservation Area will pass very close to its western edge. The Conservation Area extends on both sides of the River from Waterloo Bridge, through the City centre to beyond the Ness Islands and Whin Park. While the amenity provided by Whin Park is a relatively recent addition to the City, created in 1980, it is an established and well used facility. The defining character is its wooded rural nature and strong relationship with the River.
- 8.24 Any impact on the setting of conservation areas is a material consideration. Scottish Government policy on the historic environment accepts change must be accommodated, albeit managed, within the historic environment in the interest of sustainable economic development. There will be no physical change to the Conservation Area.
- 8.25 Representations raise the potential impact on the amenity of the Park/Riverside which is a feature of the Conservation Area. While the proposed road and crossing will be largely screened by existing trees from Whin Park and the Ness Islands, it is recognised that increased road noise will impact on these areas of open space, and therefore the quality of experience will be diminished to an extent.
- 8.26 The proposed spur from Queen's Park Roundabout to Glenurquhart Road will result in a roundabout junction on the A82(T) adjacent to Tomnahurich Cemetery which is listed in the Inventory of Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes. The introduction of a roundabout at this junction will not affect the fabric of cemetery and it is not considered that the setting will be significantly altered given the existing proximity to the trunk road. Some mature trees on the opposite side of the road will be lost but sensitive landscaping over time will provide compensation.

Natural Heritage

- 8.27 There are no natural heritage designations on the site itself. The development will involve construction adjacent to and over the River Ness which, although not part of, is connected to the River Moriston SAC.
- 8.28 The qualifying species for the River Moriston SAC are Atlantic salmon and fresh water pearl mussel. Potential effects on Atlantic salmon and fresh water pearl mussel are related to pollution of watercourses and sediment-laden runoff during

construction. Mitigation has been suggested to ensure appropriate pollution control measures are put in place. SNH is of the view that, subject to a condition requiring a site specific Construction Environmental Plan (CEMP) that there will be no significant effect on any qualifying interests, either directly or indirectly, of the River Moriston SAC.

- 8.29 With regard to European Protected Species (EPS), the site habitat may support three species in particular; otter, bat and great crested newt. SNH confirms that as a result of the proposed design, the West Link will not affect great crested newts.
- 8.30 Disturbance to otter is possible, and likely, as a result of the proposal but only during construction. Measures to avoid the pollution and sedimentation of watercourses, maintaining existing otter runs and minimising impact from floodlighting during construction are suggested as mitigation. New planting to form a wildlife corridor and the creation of otter ledges on the new swing bridge is also suggested.
- 8.31 Initial bat surveys recorded foraging and commuting through the site by small numbers of common and soprano pipistrelle species. Although no evidence of roosting bats were discovered within buildings surveyed, a number of trees were considered to have potential to support them. Given that a number of trees that have suitable bat roosting conditions will need to be removed, a licence will likely be required from SNH. SNH considers at this stage with the information available that the tests would be met and a licence granted. Bat boxes will be provided as mitigation for any loss of potential bat roosts. Over time, new planting will provide new foraging habitat.
- 8.32 Looking to other protected species, the ES indicates that there is potential for the proposal to impact on red squirrel and badger.
- 8.33 A number of badger setts were identified within the study area. There will however be no direct effect on any as a result of the proposal. The proposal will result in a loss of badger foraging ground and potential disturbance to badger pathways resulting in fragmentation of foraging habitat, particularly at Ness-side. However, to minimise this, a badger tunnel with associated fencing will be considered in the southern part of the scheme if the road scheme is constructed before other proposed developments takes place in the area. Details of this will be submitted as part of a Badger Protection Plan that will also contain information on how impacts during construction can be managed.
- 8.34 Habitat suitable for red squirrel will be lost as a result of the proposal but this is considered to amount to a small proportion of the overall habitat available. There is potential for dreys to be destroyed and squirrels to be disturbed during construction. Mitigation in the form of pre-commencement surveys, felling trees outwith the breeding season, minimising construction lighting and potential use of artificial dreys are suggested. Overall, the effect during construction is considered to be short-term and of minor significance. The new wildlife corridors that will be created will be suitable for use by red squirrel.

Trees, Woodland and Farming

- 8.35 A total of 313 trees will be removed to accommodate the proposed development. Of those, 226 are identified as 'C' category, which are either trees of low quality with a short estimated remaining life expectancy or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm. None to be removed are within any Tree Preservation Order, Conservation Area or within woodland which is listed in the Ancient Woodland Inventory. The most significant losses are around the southern end of Canal Park and around the Bught Road/Tomnahurich area. Unfortunately these are trees that make a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area.
- 8.36 The advice of the Council's Forestry Officer is that the effect on trees has been minimised as far as it can be given the scale of the development and that such loss is to be expected. However, in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Trees, Woodlands and Development compensatory planting is expected. The landscaping proposals include provision for new tree planting as mitigation but advice is that further discussion on the species, size and exact location for trees is required. This can be secured by imposition of a landscaping condition.
- 8.37 While the development will involve the loss of agricultural land, the proposal is identified in the Development Plan along with the area for housing expansion as a whole and as a result meets the tests sets out in national policy relating to the loss of agricultural land.

Sport, Recreation and Access assets

- 8.38 While the development will impact upon the existing pitches at Canal Park, with one pitch lost as a result which is not included in the Highland Rugby Football Club (HRFC) lease, HRFC is expected to remain in its current location albeit that two of the existing three rugby pitches will be repositioned, and one could be a new IRB standard all weather pitch. Facilities, including the clubhouse and parking areas, are likely to be upgraded. While HRFC has notified the applicant of its willingness to work towards a final solution, at the time of writing this Report its objection to the scheme had not been withdrawn. Subject to conditions requiring ball stop fencing and the pitches to be appropriately designed, laid out and protected during construction, SportScotland is satisfied with the proposals in relation to the rugby pitches.
- 8.39 There will be a loss of one pitch at Canal Park. In addition, the area that includes the existing American Football practice area at Queen's Park, currently leased by the Council to Inverness Blitz, will be affected by the proposal and will result in this facility being lost. Having said this, this will be relocated to the Bught. SportScotland does not consider such relocation to be compensation. However, it recognises that the wider project includes creation of a new Sports Hub with four new pitches at Charleston. SportScotland does not object to the proposal and discussions will continue with them in the context of both the Canal Park reconfiguration and development of the Sports Hub.

- 8.40 In its response to the application, SportScotland has raised concerns about the usability of the golf course during construction of the West Link. However, in addition to the proposed Sports Hub, the wider project includes proposals to relocate Torvean Golf Course to a location entirely to the northwest side of the A82(T), with provision made for a new clubhouse, practice area and green keeper facilities. As the West Link will be phased, it is possible, through conditions, to secure the re-provision of facilities in accordance with the requirements set out within the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief which are:
- Reconfiguration of the pitches at Canal Park and relocation of Inverness Blitz to Bught Park to be completed prior to the commencement of Stage 1;
 - Reconfiguration of the substantial part of the golf course to be completed prior to construction of Stage 2;
 - Delivery of the Sports Hub and parkland to be delivered once all the reconfigured golf course is playable.
- 8.41 A number of representations in pro-forma style as well as a substantive submission from Inverness Rowing Club have been received on the potential impact of the proposal on the continued use of the Canal for rowing. As a result of the requirement for the new swing bridge and moorings to accommodate canal traffic and cruise ships, there is a concern that the ability to use the canal for rowing regattas will be curtailed. While this is generally an infrequent off-season activity at a time where there is less canal traffic, the proposal is still likely to restrict the ability of row boats to turn at the end of their measured length (of 5km) that stops at the existing clubhouse.
- 8.42 Concern has also been expressed at the design and layout of the access from the proposed link road to the relocated Jacobite car park and canal bank. An improvement, rather than replacement, is sought. In its response, although not objecting, SportScotland share the concerns raised, particularly with regard to the need to ensure that regattas are not compromised. SportScotland suggest that further improvements could be made to ensure that this can work. SportScotland is also looking for the Council to secure agreement with Transport Scotland that the swing bridge will be opened when regattas are taking place. There is however an existing memorandum of understanding between Transport Scotland and Scottish Canals that can be amended to accommodate this. The applicant, although not a signatory, will need to secure this agreement before commencement of Stage 2.
- 8.43 Turning to more informal recreation there will be no direct impact on Whin Park. The existing path and play infrastructure within the Park will remain. It is noted that the Electric Burn is used by canoeists and kayakers. There will be no direct impact on this feature arising from the proposal.
- 8.44 The proposal will intersect a number of core paths along its length, including the Great Glen Way, which will need to be realigned over a short length. However, where paths intersect suitable crossing facilities and/or minor diversions will be provided. Sufficient space under the proposed bridge over the River Ness and adjacent to the abutments will be maintained to allow access along the riverbank.

- 8.45 Representations have been received from landowners within Ness-side on the issue of paths within their landholding. One landowner at Holm Mills raises an issue with an existing core path that routes through his land. In his view, this has a detrimental effect on his agricultural holding and crofting business. The proposal offers an opportunity to relocate this core path to the more formalised path that will be provided to link Dores Road to the Mill Lade Roundabout. Another however, indicates that this would result in a loss of development opportunity. However, the principle of this link is a specific requirement of the adopted Ness-side – Torvean Development Brief and forms part of the Compulsory Purchase Order. The exact routing may of course alter depending on the development proposals that come forward.
- 8.46 Stopping up orders will be progressed separately from this planning application if granted permission.

Design and Landscape and Visual Impact

- 8.47 The form and layout of the development has been subject to an iterative design process that has involved consultation with organisations such as Historic Scotland and Scottish Canals. Landscape and visual elements have been considered as part of the overall process.
- 8.48 Fundamental to assessing both landscape and visual impact of the proposed layout are Chapters 10 and 11 of the ES which relate to Visual Impact and Landscape Character respectively, along with their associated figures and appendices, which together comprise the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) element of the EIA. The purpose of LVIA is to identify and record the potential significant effects of the proposed development on the receiving environment, including the landscape, landscape character, special designations, views and amenity. Impacts are assessed both in terms of the proposal itself and cumulatively with other consented or proposed developments in the vicinity of the site.
- 8.49 The proposal lies within the 'Inverness' landscape character type (LCT) in the Inverness District Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (SNH 1999) and specifically within the LCT sub-types 'River and Canal Corridor' and 'Suburban Fringe'.
- 8.50 The LCA recognises that the general forces for change in character are the expansion of the City, particularly on the fringe. This is seen to erode the rural and agricultural character of the broader landscape. Careful design that reflects and reinforces the City's distinctive character is necessary. With particular regard to the 'River and Canal' sub-type, riverside parklands with mature trees reinforce the link between urban and rural parts of the City. A key pressure for change is seen as increased recreational use of the river side and canal. Improved linkages throughout the corridor are considered to be positive, but need to be done sensitively.
- 8.51 While the proposal would obviously effect considerable direct change to features that contribute to landscape character, the impact on the landscape as a resource

as a whole will be limited and can be mitigated through improvements to the landscaping along its route, the riverside and canal.

- 8.52 The effects on visual amenity relate to changes to available views rather than perceived changes to whole areas of a distinctive landscape character. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) indicates that the visual influence of the proposal will be contained very much to the locality; within 1 – 2 km. 37 viewpoints (VPs) were selected in order to assess visual and landscape impact. Wireframe visualisations have been produced for all of these VPs.
- 8.53 The conclusion in the ES is that the visual effect from the majority of viewpoints will be significant, with major visual impact associated with the contemporary design of the bridge over the river, the swing bridge and vehicle movement. In addition however, in the short term at least, there will be considerable impact arising from the loss of mature trees and the extent of new earthworks and infrastructure.
- 8.54 While it must be recognised that the visualisations do not provide the entire context they do, however, demonstrate the predicted effects well. It needs to be remembered however that the wireframe visualisations do not show any screening from vegetation/buildings in any view. The following VPs and visualisations are considered the most relevant to illustrate some of the most significant effects:
- VP 5 – Glenurquhart Road Cottages
 - VP 8 – Bught Road
 - VP10 – Rossie Lodge, Island Bank Road
 - VP19 – Ness-side core path on river bank
 - VP20 – Bridge Keepers Cottage
 - VP26 – Torvean Quarry

View Point 5 – Glenurquhart Road Cottages

- 8.55 This view is chosen as being representative of the experience to travellers on the A82(T) but more specifically on residents adjacent to the development; particularly the four properties collectively referred to in the ES as Glenurquhart Road Cottages – 120, 120a, 120b and 122 Glenurquhart Road. It should however be noted that the view is oblique to the experience from windows of the properties.
- 8.56 The visual experience for these properties will change by the removal of mature/semi-mature trees and shrubs from the west boundary of Queen's Park to accommodate the new roundabout onto Glenurquhart Road. A new road junction will be seen as will the rear of the stadium. The visualisations demonstrate the effect of the extent of effect of this junction and realignment of Glenurquhart Road to these receptors. In the evening, lighting would be more prominent.
- 8.57 There is limited ability to mitigate the effect here although as many of the existing trees as possible along the top end of Bught Road will be retained and supplemented by new planting on what remains of Queen's Park.

View Point 8 – Bught Road

- 8.58 This view is chosen to represent the effect of the proposed development on sensitive receptors using the Great Glen Way but would also represent those arriving by car to Canal Park. It demonstrates the experience from VP 7 – Leisure Centre and VP – Rugby Club albeit in different direction.
- 8.59 The visualisations demonstrate the effect of the Queen's Park Roundabout and road leading to this which will be elevated in this view. The massing and associated staircases/walkways will detract from the existing experience which provides glimpses of movement on the canal and the backdrop of Torvean.
- 8.60 The contribution that existing trees/shrubs make to this experience is evident in this view. It is anticipated that the majority of the mature trees along Bught Road will remain. Landscaping and replacement planting will over time reduce the effect.

View Point 10 – Rossie Lodge, Island Bank Road

- 8.61 This view is more specific but could be used to gauge representative views up river from the east bank of the river along Island Bank Road. The viewpoint is taken close to the river bank with mature trees masking the view to an extent.
- 8.62 The visualisations demonstrate the effect of the new bridge on the river and residential receptors on the east bank of the river. While the image is taken at ground level through a mature tree canopy and the angle of view is oblique, increased visibility will be gained with height. Quite clearly the proposal will introduce a new structure into the view. Its simple form, that replicates to an extent Ness Bridge further downstream, is at low level which does to some extent provide mitigation. The design is considered appropriate in this context. Views to the wider landscape beyond will generally be unaffected.

View Point 19 – Ness-side core path on river bank

- 8.63 This view is chosen to represent views of core path walkers on the east bank of the river heading north and the effect of the road which would be to the immediate east. It lies within woodland adjacent to the entrance to the Holm Mill Race.
- 8.64 Walkers would experience traffic activity/movement to the east as well as noise. This would result in a considerable loss in amenity. However, planting will remain within the area and be supplemented by the road scheme. Some screening would therefore give protection to the path user.

View Point 20 – Bridge Keepers Cottage

- 8.65 This view is chosen to represent views of canal users and residents of the Keepers Cottage. The moorings for Jacobite Cruises is immediately west of the viewpoint. The A82(T) is 50m behind.
- 8.66 Users would experience the proposed canal swing bridge and associated infrastructure close up as well as Canal Park Roundabout just beyond. Traffic

movement and noise from a different direction than currently experienced may be noticeable also. In the evening, lighting would be more prominent. There will be a loss of mature trees to the west. Replacement planting is proposed but will take time to mature.

View Point 26 – Torvean Quarry

- 8.67 This view is specific (path) as well as representative giving a clear and elevated view of the River Ness, Ness-side and Holm Mills.
- 8.68 The proposals would clearly introduce new elements into a landscape of semi-rural character. The majority of the linear woodland along the eastern river bank will remain and new planting will establish over time. In time the road will be seen in the context of urban expansion. The new bridge over the river will be clearly visible in this view.
- 8.69 While the impact on visual amenity in the vicinity of Ness-side has been assessed as significant this area is identified as an urban expansion area and its semi-rural nature will change over time in any event. As indicated above, the majority of landscape screening along the river edge will remain and this will mitigate the effect when viewed from west of the canal and Torvean. Views from Dores Road will generally be unaffected although traffic movement will be apparent.
- 8.70 There is no doubt that the proposal will bring about substantial change to the area. It is considered that the most significant impacts will be around the immediate vicinity of the new bridge crossing over the river, at Canal Park/Queen's Park and around the canal at Tomnahurich. Except from the car park/entrance, the visual impact on Whin Park is not considered as substantial as a result of screening from existing woodland. The effects will be experienced mostly by canal users, core path walkers, users of Canal Park and the leisure centre as well as some residents.
- 8.71 There are several residential properties close to the proposed development on Glenurquhart Road, at Ness-side, along Dores Road and on the west side of the canal. For residents to the west of the canal, opposite Ness-side, the visual effect of the proposal will be screened to a large extent by existing planting. From Dores Road, the development will generally be below existing vegetation on the west side of the road. While Mill Lade Roundabout will be prominent in closer views, for example at Ness-side Farm, for these receptors the effects of the proposal must be considered in the emerging context which is City expansion. Residents on Glenurquhart Road adjacent to Tomnahurich Bridge will be familiar with the traffic and activity associated with the A82(T). Although their direct outlook will not be onto the new roundabout, a significant change to amenity will nevertheless occur through the loss of vegetation and introduction of new built features in this area. Improving the quality and experience of the Canal and vicinity may go some way to reducing this effect.
- 8.72 The quality and appropriateness of landscaping, tree planting and use of materials in the detailing of buildings and infrastructure will be key to the success of any mitigation. While the landscape plans submitted are considered to be broadly acceptable further discussion on the type, size and exact location of replacement

trees will be required. The issue raised by Scottish Canals regarding the quality of place is also relevant and further consideration should be given to the detailed design of buildings and infrastructure around the canal in particular. This can be addressed through condition.

Transport users – motor and non-motorised users

- 8.73 The requirement for the proposal is well established and its clear purpose, as described above, is to provide for more efficient cross-City movement; for instance providing an ability to travel from east to west and vice versa over the river, and canal, thereby avoiding the City Centre, as well as improving access to key facilities for residents to the east. The Transport Assessment submitted in support of the application concludes that the proposal will result in a reduction of traffic within the City centre. In particular there are 2 principal bridges over the River Ness with limited capacity. This project will reduce traffic in the City centre in the vicinity of Ness Bridge and the junctions on Bridge Street, Castle Street, Castle Road as well as Glenurquhart Road, Kenneth Street and Bank Street as well as across Ness Bridge itself. This will be a major benefit when Ness Bridge, which was built in 1966, is due for major maintenance. All of this will encourage cycling and walking within the city centre making for a more pleasant environment.
- 8.74 The tandem swing bridge arrangement will ensure that there is always a fixed link for provision of vehicles crossing the canal. This would resolve the current delays experienced by residents and visitors during the summer months when Tomnahurich Bridge is opened to canal traffic. It will allow major maintenance on the bridge and resolve the difficulties experienced due to the mechanism jamming with expansion of bridge members due to summer temperatures. It would also improve response times for emergency vehicles and bus journey time reliability.
- 8.75 The Transport Assessment considers that journey times will be improved for movements to/from the west of the City. The impact of the proposal from the perspective of the driver is a positive one in that it reduces driver stress and fuel usage and from that of the environment results in lower CO₂ emissions and a less crowded City centre.
- 8.76 With regard to pedestrians and non-motorised users, the bridge will act as a link to the key facilities around Queen's Park/Bught and beyond. It will improve accessibility and provide greater opportunity for active travel. The Dores Road and Island Bank Road connection from Ness-side to the city centre is narrow with a lack of footpath provision and as a result facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are inadequate. The project will provide an efficient link from Ness-side across the river at Mill Lade and the opportunity of providing a segregated cycle track footpath link following the north bank of the River Ness to the City centre. This will improve the opportunity for active travel for leisure and employment from the south and west of the city.
- 8.77 While some objectors, and some Community Councils, point to the difficulties with shared footways from both a pedestrian and cyclist perspective, including at roundabouts, the design is deliberately consistent with the SDR and provides economies in terms of design and consistency. Segregated footways and

cycleways would increase land take and add a maintenance burden. Roundabouts are considered necessary as they provide connectivity from the distributor road to residential areas as well as providing a measure of traffic calming along the length of the distributor. The project will be subject to the four stages of Road Safety Audit with Stage I having been completed. In addition, a cycle audit will be carried out on the completed design. These audits are a major benefit to safeguard the interests of all road users.

- 8.78 It is anticipated that as housing development progresses on both sides of the river and canal, new opportunities will arise to link the principal crossing points to a variety of different routes, offering alternatives to travelling the full length of the West Link.
- 8.79 To facilitate connections, three underpasses below the road are proposed; two at Queen's Park Roundabout and one to the west of the Torvean Roundabout. These are detailed as fully enclosed concrete walkways 4m in width ranging from 14m in length at Torvean to 18m and 28m in length at Queen's Park. Lighting will be provided. There is potential for this type of arrangement to be considered hostile by users. Scottish Canals has indicated that initiatives such as the Scottish Government's Scenic Routes Project offer potential to improve the pedestrian experience around the area. This should be considered. At the very least, a high quality of finish for the existing designs would be expected. This can be achieved by condition.

Drainage and Flooding

- 8.80 The majority of the proposal lies outwith the areas at risk from flooding from the River Ness although the proposed north abutment to the river crossing will lie within the functional floodplain and bridge piers in the river. The north abutment which will reduce flood storage by around 288m³. To mitigate this, ground levels will be lowered immediately upstream to provide 309m³ of compensatory flood storage. SEPA has raised no concern relating to flood risk.
- 8.81 With regard to drainage, the proposal will result in some alteration to the land drainage patterns in some locations. This is most notable around Ness-side. While there are no obvious drainage channels or ditches being crossed it is likely within these areas that the proposal will affect the surface flow by effectively creating a barrier. Within Ness-side the proposed drainage scheme has been designed to intercept surface water and shallow sub-surface flow and redirect water via outfalls to the River Ness.
- 8.82 Drainage for surface water from the road itself will utilise the established principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) with water collected either via lined ditches along the road edge leading to lined infiltration 'ponds' that will discharge to the River Ness or filter drains. Subject to details on the design and maintenance of these the Council's Flood Team has no objection. SEPA has raised no concern relating to drainage.

Construction impacts and pollution control

- 8.83 The most sensitive ecological receptor for the construction phase is the River Moriston SAC albeit that the risks to this SAC are considered low. Particular care is needed to avoid particulate or chemicals entering the water environment which could affect salmonids.
- 8.84 In recognition of this, and the potential to affect groundwater generally, the applicant has committed to a number of mitigation measures relating to pollution prevention. The expectation is that this will be developed further into a comprehensive Construction Environmental Management Document (CEMD) and Plans (CEMPs) that will be finalised prior to construction and will include topics such as a pollution management plan, drainage plan (to protect water courses) and site waste management plan as well as best practice guidance; for example on the storage of chemicals and fuel, and site waste management plan. Monitoring proposals will be required as will an Incident Response Plan. The protection of all sensitive habitat and species will be secured through employment of an Ecological Clerk of Work (ECOW) to supervise the mitigation proposals throughout construction.
- 8.85 There is potential during construction for increased flood risk. This arises principally from the construction of the north abutment as discussed above. The ES includes procedures to be adopted to mitigate effects including avoiding operations with periods most likely prone to flood events (winter).
- 8.86 Neither SEPA nor SNH object to the proposals on the basis that conditions are applied to secure the proposed mitigation. This can be achieved through the requirement of a Construction Environmental Management Document (CEMD) and individual Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs).
- 8.87 In addition to the effects on the water environment and habitat, there is potential for construction related noise and activity impacts, including vibration and dust, which could affect the amenity of neighbours. While the ES assesses the effect on neighbouring sensitive properties as not significant, mitigation to reduce the potential impacts is suggested to include:
- Adherence to British Standard 5228 “Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites”, including proper maintenance of equipment and the use of noise attenuation apparatus;
 - Implementation of dust management controls;
 - Liaison with neighbours and Environmental Health Officer on work schedule.
- 8.88 With regard to noise, it is no longer considered suitable to control construction hours through planning conditions. Bespoke powers for regulating construction noise exist within the Control of Pollution Act 1974; powers which enable Environmental Health to specify working hours where problems exist. What can be controlled through condition, as requested by Environmental Health, are proposals to manage the effects of noise and vibration on near neighbours in particular. This

can be done through the CEMD/CEMP approach and may include working hours. Environmental Health has identified that further assessment of noise/vibration from piling will be required when the detailed construction methodology is better known. Again however, this can be covered as a specific requirement of the CEMD.

- 8.89 The measures suggested to control dust arising is based on existing guidance from the Mayor of London/London Council. TEC Services – Environmental Health consider this to be appropriate and again consider that this can be adequately covered by a specific CEMP based on the mitigation measures detailed in the ES.
- 8.90 While the effect of construction traffic and activity is considered by the applicant not to be significant, TEC Services – Environmental Health suggest that further assessment on this would need to be undertaken once traffic flow data is known. This can be sought by condition. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) suggested by Transport Scotland and TEC Services – Roads and Transportation will assist in regulating activity on the public road network in the interests of amenity.
- 8.91 A landowner within Ness-side has raised concerns regarding the effects of construction on the current industrial/commercial occupiers of their landholding. The assumption is that this relates to temporary occupation of part of the landholding for the purpose of construction. This is not material to this application but is a matter for the Council to negotiate with the landowner in due course. The effect of construction activity on occupiers here can be addressed through the CEMD and the CTMP.

Operational impacts

- 8.92 Operational impacts of the proposed development will relate to three main types of environmental pollution; noise, air and light. In addition there is potential for ground vibration. All these factors may affect amenity.
- 8.93 With regard to air quality, the ES assessment predicts that the NO₂ (Nitrogen Dioxide) and PM₁₀ (Particulate) concentrations will not exceed the relevant national standards at the receptor locations considered. In all 13 locations were chosen. They included receptors such as Whin Park and residential properties in the vicinity of the route including Ness-side Lodge and 122 Glenurquhart Road which are some of the closest. All changes in pollutant concentrations are considered by the applicant to be negligible or slight adverse and therefore not significant. As such TEC Service – Environmental Health does not consider further mitigation necessary.
- 8.94 Turning to operational noise, the noise modelling undertaken indicates that in the short term 786 properties will receive a moderate increase in noise levels and 68 properties will receive a major increase in noise levels but 347 will receive a decrease in noise levels. In the long term, 165 properties will receive a moderate increase in noise levels and 14 will receive a major increase in noise levels. The reduction in noise will generally be felt by properties along Dores Road/Island Bank Road. The increase in noise will, as expected, generally be experienced by properties in the immediate vicinity of the new road.

- 8.95 Mitigation is proposed in the form of specific noise barrier/earth bunding at Canal Park and at Ness-side in combination with fencing and masonry walls. TEC Services – Environmental Health has no objection on the basis that the noise mitigation measures detailed within the ES are implemented and maintained but it requests further assessment on the potential for noise generated by movement joints on the bridge crossings if these are required. These matters can be secured by condition.
- 8.96 Advice from TEC Services – Environmental Health is that some properties may meet the trigger level for the Noise Insulation (Scotland) Regulations 1975. These regulations provide for insulation works or a grant to be made available for properties which meet the trigger level and other qualifying criteria. Therefore TEC Services – Environmental Health advises that a further more detailed assessment should be undertaken to determine if any properties meet all the qualifying criteria. This is a duty of the Council as Roads Authority and therefore does not require to be controlled by condition.
- 8.97 According to the ES it has not been possible to provide predictions of the ground borne vibration at this stage. TEC Services – Environmental Health advise that once the relevant information is available a further assessment of the ground born vibration would be required for areas where the road passes close to sensitive properties. Again this can be controlled by condition.
- 8.98 Lighting is a design requirement for the proposed road in the interest of safety. While this will be low level on the new River crossing, to mitigate effects on amenity and to protect aquatic species, 8 – 10m high lighting columns will be provided elsewhere along the road length. These will however be screened LED lanterns to a modern standard that will be expected to be designed to minimise sky glow and/or glare. In the interest of protecting amenity, further details of all lighting can be controlled through condition.

Other material considerations raised

- 8.99 A Ness-side landowner is concerned that the proposal takes up too much developable land, particularly around the Mill Lade Roundabout. However, it is clear that development potential here is likely only to be realised with the provision of this road and the links to it. Discussions are ongoing with the landowner as to how the adjoining land should be developed but these are matters more appropriately considered through the Compulsory Purchase Order and future planning application processes.
- 8.100 Representations raise the issue of the cost of loss of recreational areas not having been fully assessed. In reading this at first it is assumed this refers to the financial cost of the scheme as a whole which is not a material planning consideration but what may actually be implied is the social and related financial cost to their loss. In simple terms however, there will be no net loss of recreational facilities. Indeed when considered as part of the wider project, there will be an improvement.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The principle and broad corridor of the route alignment presented in this application is firmly established in planning policy and has been confirmed at three successive local plan inquiries. The most recent planning policy contained within Policy 8 of the HwLDP, Policy 26 of the Inverness Local Plan (as continued in force) and the associated Supplementary Guidance gives a comprehensive basis which allows the planning application to be determined.
- 9.2 As is evident from the assessment the majority of the impacts of the proposed development, including many of those relating to protected species and sensitive sites, will not be significantly detrimental and could be adequately controlled by securing the proposed mitigation measures through condition.
- 9.3 The majority of representations received raise issues regarding the option chosen by the Council for the West Link. This is not directly relevant to the determination of this application. The issues raised that are relevant but cannot necessarily be addressed by direct technical solutions are the effects on visual amenity and the general experience of receptors that either live within or visit this part of Inverness.
- 9.4 The proposal will have a significant visual impact, particularly around Canal Park/Queen's Park and Glenurquhart Road/Tomnahurich Bridge. The area around the existing canal is already influenced by road traffic noise and activity created by the A82(T) which is not as evident at Bught, Canal Park and Whin Park. The proposal will increase traffic noise within these areas and will alter the existing experience. However, these effects can be mitigated to an extent by physical noise mitigation measures and new planting as well as giving due consideration to general enhancement of the public realm.
- 9.5 There will be a loss of sporting/recreational space in this location. However, with it likely that Highland Rugby Football Club will stay at Canal Park the overall loss will be limited to one sports pitch. This will be compensated for by proposals, as part of the wider project, for the Sports Hub proposed at Charleston. In addition, the wider project will ensure significant improvement to the Torvean Golf Course. It is considered that the interests of the Inverness Rowing Club can also be accommodated.
- 9.6 For the Ness-side area, the proposal will introduce a new development that will introduce significant change in the short-term. In the longer term however it will form part of the wider expansion of Inverness as has been envisaged for many years. This needs to be recognised. The development is not considered to have a significantly detrimental effect on the majority of residents along Dores Road and should result in a reduction of traffic activity that will improve traffic noise for residents living along this route into the City centre.
- 9.7 The proposal brings about clear benefits in providing for more efficient cross-City movement, but not without impacts. More detailed consideration of the design, layout and finish of infrastructure and buildings and quality of landscaping are required, as are improvements to the public realm around the canal in particular, to ensure that these impacts can be mitigated as far as possible.

- 9.8 Subject to securing this mitigation through conditions, it can be concluded that the proposals would not result in significantly detrimental affects and would therefore comply with the Development Plan.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the application be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and reasons:

1. Planning Permission is hereby granted for a 3.2km length of single carriageway road with 5 roundabouts, a swing bridge over the Caledonian Canal and new bridge over the River Ness and associated development, as detailed with plans HRS7126 PL04 – PL07, which shall be developed in two sequential stages as follows:

Stage 1 – Holm Roundabout to Glenurquhart Road

Stage 2 – Tandem Canal Bridge and works to west of the canal

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of permission and control phasing of implementation.

2. No development shall commence on Stage 1 (North abutment – Queen’s Park Roundabout) until such time as the pitches at Canal Park have been reconfigured in accordance with a scheme, which will include details of the design specification, the appointed contractor(s) and work programme, has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with SportScotland. Such scheme shall include details for protection of pitches used by Highland Rugby Football Club during the construction of the road. The agreed scheme shall be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate level of replacement facilities are provided before construction of the road link and that the impact on new facilities at Canal Park can be minimised.

3. As part of the reconfiguration of the Canal Park pitches, four metre (4m) high ball stop fencing shall be erected to the south-east and north-east sides of Canal Park, details of which, including their location, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with SportScotland. The agreed fencing shall be provided prior to the pitches being available for use.

Reason: To minimise the impact of balls on footpaths and the clubhouse parking area as a result of the reorientation of the pitches.

4. No development shall commence on Stage 1 (Mill Lade Roundabout – Canal Park Roundabout) until details of the ball stop fencing identified on drawing HRS7126 PL05 has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with SportScotland. The agreed scheme shall be implemented.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision in the interests of road safety and to preserve the continuing use of Canal Park as a location for Rugby Football.

5. No development shall commence on Stage 2 until a scheme, including work programme, to ensure that a fully operational 18 hole golf course (the Torvean Golf Course) is available at all times both during and after construction of this stage of the road has been submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Planning Authority in consultation with SportScotland. The agreed scheme shall be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate 18 hole golf course is available at all times during and after construction of Stage 2 of the road link.

6. No development shall commence on Stage 2 until revised plans and details, including a timetable for provision, relating to vehicular access to the Canal towpath and boat moorings and pontoons on the west side of the new swing bridge has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with SportScotland. The agreed plans and details shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable.

Reason: To ensure the continued unimpeded operation of the rowing facilities on the canal by Inverness Rowing Club.

7. No development shall commence on Stage 2 until confirmation that an appropriate and binding agreement between Transport Scotland and Scottish Canals regarding the sequence and operation of both canal swing bridges, that takes into consideration the needs of Inverness Rowing Club, has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that the new swing bridge will be capable of being opened when required by Inverness Rowing Club for rowing regattas.

8. For the avoidance of doubt the designs for the new swing bridge control building, plant building and Jacobite Cruises replacement building shown on drawings HRS7126 PL30 – PL32 are not approved. No development shall commence on Stage 2 until revised designs that take into consideration the proposals by Scottish Canals to improve the public realm around the canal has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with Scottish Canals. Only the approved designs shall be constructed.

Reason: To ensure that the design of these elements are of an appropriate quality to this important gateway into Inverness and compatible with proposed environmental improvement work by Scottish Canals.

9. The entrance walls, including parapet, string courses, reveals and returns, leading into the proposed underpasses at Queen's Park and Torvean Roundabouts shall be finished in natural stone, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority before the commencement of development within each relevant stage. Only the agreed detailing and materials shall be implemented.

Reason: To ensure a high standard of design that is compatible with the setting of the Caledonian Canal and the general aspiration for improvements to the public realm in this location.

10. All walling identified within plans HRS7126 V2–S35/001–004 as landscape design and mitigation shall be constructed of natural stone details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of the stage to which it relates. The approved details shall be implemented and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a high standard of design and finish.

11. No development shall start on any Stage until a Construction Environmental Management Document is submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with SNH and SEPA. The Document shall include:

- An updated Schedule of Mitigation (SM) including all mitigation proposed in support of the planning application, other relevant agreed mitigation (e.g. as required by agencies) as may be set out in other relevant planning conditions.
- Processes to control / action changes from the agreed Schedule of Mitigation.
- Processes for informing neighbouring residents, potentially with involvement of Community Councils, of the work programme and likely significant events such as temporary road/path closures, heavy loads and working hours.
- The following site specific Construction and Environmental Management Plans (CEMP);
 - i. pollution prevention plan
 - ii. drainage and surface water management plan with specific regard to protection of the River Ness (link to River Moriston SAC)
 - iii. chemical pollution plan
 - iv. waste management plan
 - v. species protection plans, specifically with regard to protection of Atlantic Salmon, Bat, Otter and Red Squirrel
 - vi. Noise and vibration mitigation plan based on guidance with Parts 1 & 2 of BS5228: “Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites” including assessment and mitigation for any piling requirements
 - vii. Dust mitigation plan based on the GLA/London Council guidance
- Details of the appointment of an appropriately qualified Environmental Clerk of Works with roles and responsibilities which shall include but not necessarily be limited to:
 - i. Providing training to the developer and contractors on their responsibilities to ensure that work is carried out in strict accordance with environmental protection requirements;

- ii. Monitoring compliance with all environmental and nature conservation mitigation works and working practices approved under this consent;
 - iii. Advising the developer on adequate protection for environmental and nature conservation interests within, and adjacent to, the application site;
 - iv. Directing the placement of the development (including any micro-siting, if permitted by the terms of this consent) and the avoidance of sensitive features; and
 - v. The power to call a halt to development on site where environmental considerations warrant such action.
- Details of any other methods of monitoring, auditing, reporting and communication of environmental management on site and with the client, Planning Authority and other relevant parties.
 - Statement of any additional persons responsible for 'stopping the job / activity' if in potential breach of a mitigation or legislation occurs.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority the development shall proceed in accordance with the agreed Document.

Reason: To protect the environment from the construction and operation of the development.

12. No development shall commence on each stage until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authorities. The CTMP shall include details relating to:

- Traffic management measures including accommodation works to manage construction traffic
- Measures to minimise traffic impacts on existing users
- Measures to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and bus users
- Details of temporary signage
- Details of construction vehicle routing

The measures identified within CTMP and agreed shall be implemented.

Reason: To protect non motorised users and maintain the safety and free flow of the road network.

13. No development shall commence on each stage until the following road drainage details have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority:

- Infiltration basins, including inlet/outlet structures, cross sections, fencing and signage;
- An operation and maintenance manual detailing the frequency and type of maintenance measures for all proposed SUDS infrastructure;

- The design of the roadside ditches.

The agreed details, and maintenance as appropriate, shall thereafter be implemented to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the design and maintenance of the SUDS infrastructure is appropriate.

14. No development shall commence on each stage until an assessment of the implications on sensitive receptors of traffic noise arising from construction has been undertaken and a report detailing any mitigation/management controls necessary, including a programme for implementation, has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority. The agreed mitigation/management controls shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed programme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of sensitive receptors from traffic noise during construction.

15. In the event that movement joints are required in the design of the new bridge crossing the River Ness, a further assessment of the implications of traffic noise on near sensitive receptors shall be undertaken and submitted to the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of construction of the bridge. Such assessment shall include recommendations for any additional mitigation necessary and a programme for implementation. The agreed mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed programme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of sensitive receptors from traffic noise during construction.

16. No development shall commence on each stage until an assessment of the implications on sensitive receptors of ground borne vibration during operation of the road has been undertaken and a report detailing any mitigation necessary, including a programme for implementation, has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority. The agreed mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed programme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of sensitive receptors from ground vibration during operation.

17. Within six months of the first anniversary of the opening of each phase, traffic noise shall be re-assessed and compared to the predicted effects contained with the ES submitted in support of this application and a report detailing any further mitigation deemed necessary to protect sensitive receptors, including a programme for implementation, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority. The agreed mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed programme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of sensitive receptors from traffic noise that was not predicted.

18. No development shall commence on each stage, including tree felling works, until pre-commencement surveys to locate the presence or absence of otter, bats and squirrel is undertaken and a report of survey has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The survey shall inform any mitigation measures identified in the Species Protection Plan required as part of the Construction Environmental Management Document/Plan(s) approved under Condition 11.

Reason: To protect nature conservation interests from construction activities.

19. No development shall commence on each stage until a Badger Protection Plan has been submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Planning Authority in consultation with Scottish Natural Heritage. The agreed plan shall be implemented.

Reason: To protect the badger interest of the site.

20. With effect from the date of this permission, no trees are to be cut down, uprooted, topped, lopped (including roots) or wilfully damaged in any way, without the prior written permission of the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees before, during and after construction.

21. All tree works are to be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced arboriculturalist in accordance with BS:3998(2010) Tree Work – Recommendations.

Reason: To ensure the tree works are carried out to a high standard.

22. Prior to any site excavation or groundworks within each stage a Tree Protection Plan, Arboricultural Method Statement and a Scheme of Supervision (all in accordance with BS5837:2012 - Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction) are to be submitted to and subsequently approved in writing by the planning authority. All retained trees are to be protected against construction damage using protective barriers located beyond the Root Protection Area (in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition & Construction). Barriers are to remain in place throughout the construction period and must not be moved or removed without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of retained trees during construction and thereafter.

23. A suitably qualified Arboricultural consultant must be employed at the applicant's expense to ensure that the Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement are implemented to the agreed standard. Stages requiring supervision as per the Scheme of Supervision are to be agreed with the Planning Authority and certificates of compliance for each stage are to be submitted for approval.

Reason: To ensure the protection of retained trees throughout the construction period.

24. No development shall commence on each stage until a detailed Landscape Plan and maintenance programme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The Landscape Plan shall be implemented in full during the first planting season following commencement of development or as otherwise may be agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity.

25. A suitably qualified landscape consultant must be employed at the applicant's expense to ensure that the Landscape Plan is implemented and thereafter maintained to the agreed standard. Stages requiring supervision are to be agreed with the planning authority and certificates of compliance for each stage are to be submitted for approval.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and ensuring that appropriate mitigation treatments are secured.

26. No development shall commence on each Stage until a detailed Access Management Plan for public access across the site (as existing, during construction and following completion) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. The plan shall include details showing:

- i. All existing access points, paths, core paths, tracks, rights of way and other routes (whether on land or inland water), and any areas currently outwith or excluded from statutory access rights under Part One of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, within and adjacent to the application site;
- ii. Any areas proposed for exclusion from statutory access rights, for reasons of privacy, disturbance or effect on curtilage related to proposed buildings or structures;
- iii. All paths, tracks and other routes for use by walkers, riders, cyclists and any other relevant outdoor access enhancement i.e. car park (including construction specifications, signage, information leaflets, proposals for on-going maintenance etc.);
- iv. Any diversion of paths, tracks or other routes (whether on land or inland water), temporary or permanent, proposed as part of the development (including details of mitigation measures, diversion works, duration and signage).

The approved Access Management Plan, and any associated works, shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development or as otherwise may be agreed within the approved plan.

Reason: To safeguard and maximise the opportunities for continued public access in and around the development site in accordance with Policy 77 of the HwLDP.

27. No development shall commence on each Stage until a programme for the evaluation, preservation and recording of any archaeological and historic features affected by the proposed development, including a timetable for investigation, all in accordance with the attached specification, has been submitted to, and agreed in

writing by, the Planning Authority. The agreed proposals shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable for investigation.

Reason: In order to protect the archaeological and historic interest of the site.

28. There shall be no drainage connections to the trunk road drainage system.

Reason: To ensure that the efficiency of the existing drainage network is not affected.

29. The A82(T) Tomnahurich Swing Bridge shall remain closed during the weekday morning, lunchtime and evening peak hour periods, until a second swing bridge crossing of the Caledonian Canal is complete and fully operational to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in consultation with Transport Scotland.

Reason: To minimise interference with the safety and free flow of the traffic on the trunk road.

30. The proposed pedestrian crossing point on the A82(T) to the east of Tomnahurich Roundabout shall be constructed to a layout, type and method of construction that shall be submitted to and agreed by, Transport Scotland prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: To maintain the safety and free flow of the trunk road network.

31. Prior to the commencement of road construction, details of all proposed lighting shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority. All lighting shall be designed to avoid extraneous light pollution or urban "sky glow." Only the approved lighting shall be implemented.

Reason: In order to ensure proper selection of lighting that reduces 'sky glow' in the interest of amenity.

Signature:

Designation: Head of Planning & Building Standards

Author: David Mudie (01463) 702255

Date: 28 March 2014

Background Papers: Documents referred to in report and in case file.

Appendix 1 – Letters of Representation

OBJECTORS

1. Mrs Frances Forrest, Druid Lodge, Druid Temple Way, Inverness, IV2 6UQ,
2. Mr Ian Waddell, Duart Lodge, Aultnaskiach, Inverness, IV2 4BB,
3. Mr and Mrs Kay and Jack MacDonald, 6 Knocknagael Farm Cottages, Essich Road, Inverness, IV2 6AJ,
4. Mr Ken Povey, 5 Old School Place, Inverness, IV3 8 AP,
5. Mrs Joanne Kidd, 16 Boswell Road, Inverness, IV2 3EJ,
6. Mrs Cathy Stafford, Clach Na Sanais, Croy, Inverness, IV2 5PG,
7. Mrs M Macaulay, 1 Bishops View, Inverness, IV3 8LJ,
8. Mr William Moir, 36 Heatherley Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4AW,
9. Mr Gordon Mackenzie, 28 Boswell Road, Inverness, IV2 3EJ,
10. Dr Robert Peckham, 46 Slackbuie Way, Inverness, IV2 6AT,
11. Mrs Maureen Wallace, 63 Drumfield Road, Inverness, IV2 4XL,
12. Katrina Coutts, Craggie Farmhouse, Daviot, Inverness, IV2 5XQ,
13. Mrs Fiona Kelly, Cradlehall Farmhouse, Caulfield Road North, Cradlehall Farmhouse, Inverness, IV2 5NG,
14. Ms Jackie Mackenzie, 41 Ardhalm Place, Inverness, IV2 4QG,
15. Mr Kevin McDonald, 1, Holm Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4QZ,
16. Mr Dougal Macdougall, 37 Dores Road, Inverness, IV2 4GB,
17. Miss Briagh McMaster, 18 Islandbank road, Inverness, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
18. Mr John Carson, Gorsehill Cottage, 61 Culloden Rd, Inverness, IV27HH,
19. Mr Michael White, 14 Lochside Place, Bridge of Don, Aberdeen, AB23 8GA,
20. Dr Catriona Duncan, 65 Firthview Drive, Inverness, IV3 8NS,
21. Mr Robert Greenwood, 8B Gordonville Road, Inverness, Highland, IV2 4SS,
22. Ms Joan M Stewart, 25A Ballifeary Lane, Inverness, IV3 5PQ,
23. Mr Robert Urquhart, 56 Morvich Way, Inverness, Highland, IV2 4PJ,
24. Mr Graham A Geddes, 25 Lomond Way, Leachkin, Inverness, IV3 8NZ,
25. Mrs Diane Stark, 5 Cedarwood Drive, Inverness, Highland, IV2 6GU,
26. Mr Robert Greenwood, 8b Gordonville Road, Haugh, Inverness, IV2 4SS,
27. Mr Fraser Urquhart, Bellfield, Blackpark, Inverness, IV3 8PW,
28. Mr Andrew Ford, Sweethope, Old Smithton, Inverness, IV2 7NL,
29. Mr Angus Noble, 24 Perceval Road, Inverness, IV3 5QE,
30. Mr and Mrs D Milne, Bennachie, 20 Rosshill Drive, Maryburgh, Dingwall, IV7 8EH,
31. Kathleen Macpherson, 73 Drumsmittal Road, North Kessock, Inverness, IV1 3JU,
32. Mrs K MacDonald, 6 Knocknagael Farm Cottages, Essich Road, Inverness, IV2 6AJ,
33. Margaret Mackenzie, 8 Mackintosh Place, Inverness, IV2 3US,
34. K Greenwood, Woodend, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5BS,
35. Mrs M Munro, 16 Cradlehall Park, Inverness, IV2 5BZ,
36. Lorraine Rennie, 68 Miller Street, Inverness, IV2 3DL,
37. Ms Anne Newell, 16 Beechwood Road, Raigmore, Inverness, IV2 3UQ,
38. Mrs Alice Wood, 21 Swanston Avenue, Inverness, IV3 8QW,
39. Mrs D MacIennan, 9 Erracht Road, Inverness, IV2 4RE,
40. David Watson, Burnside, Milton Of Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7NX,
41. R Riddoch, Meadowpark, 10 Culduthel Gardens, Inverness, IV2 4AR,
42. Mrs M Groat, 76 Hazel Avenue, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7WR,
43. Calum MacPherson, 27 Brookfield, Culloden Moor, Inverness, IV2 5GL,
44. Mr and Mrs R A Ewait, 9 Trentham Court, Inverness, IV2 5DF,
45. E Quick, 6 High Street, Cromarty, IV11 8UZ,
46. Roderick and Ishbel Maccrimmon, 51 Balnakyle Road, Inverness, IV2 4DJ,
47. Alasdair Gow, 29 Broom Drive, Inverness, IV2 4EG,
48. Robert Barnes-Watts, 40 Canal Terrace, Inverness, IV3 8QQ,
49. Mr and Mrs Norman Geddes, 7 Boarstone Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4XW,

50. Debbie Barnard, 4 Forbes Drive, Nairn, IV12 4QY,
51. Baraat Boutalet, Flat 6-4 , 42 West Graham Street, Glasgow, G4 9LH,
52. Duncan Brown, 83 Wood Street, Torry , Aberdeen , AB11 9RB,
53. Mary C Buchan, 7 Succoth Park, Edinburgh , EH12 6BX,
54. Graham Butler, 8 Eildon Street, Edinburgh, EH3 5JU,
55. Maggie Campbell, Penwick Farm, Auldearn, Nairn , IV12 5QG,
56. D Carter, Birchwood, 5 Midmills Road, Inverness, IV2 3NZ,
57. R J Dunse, Overdale, Academy Street, Castle Douglas, DG7 1EE,
58. M Clouston, Easter Suddie Farm, Munlochy, IV8 8PA,
59. Louise Horsburgh, 30 Sandpiper Road, Lochwinnoch,
60. Kath Cideris, 7 Dalcroy Road, Croy, Inverness, IV2 5PQ,
61. Hannah Campbell, Penwick Farm, Auldearn, Nairn,
62. WG Coulthard, ADDRESS INCOMPLETE,
63. D Davidson, 32 Broom Drive, Inverness, IV2 4EG,
64. Fiona L Doughty, 13 Schoolcroft, Culbokie, Dingwall, IV7 8LB,
65. J Duncan, 24 Binghillrd Ntm, Milltimber, Aberdeen, AB13 0JD,
66. David Ferguson, Flat B1, 92 Queens Drive, Glasgow , G42 8BJ,
67. Jason C Foster, 37 Stevenson Road, Edinburgh, EH20 0LU,
68. S Frost, 55 Durniebootle Crescent, Aberdeen, AB15 8NR,
69. Dorothy Gaddis, 97 Mote Hill, The Park, Hamilton, ML3 6EA,
70. Colin Gilmour, Glentyan, Culbokie, Dingwall, IV7 8JH,
71. Shona Gilmour, Glentyan, Culbokie, Dingwall, IV7 8JH,
72. Pam Gordon, 41 Merryton Crescent, Nairn, IV12 5AQ,
73. Robert Gordon, 11 Primrose Hill, Slackbuie, Inverness, IV2 6BQ,
74. Laura Graham, 5 Royellen Avenue, Hamilton, ML3 8QH,
75. Janet Grigor, 56 Allan Park Crescent, Edinburgh, EH14 1LF,
76. Caitlin Horsburgh, 30 Sandpiper Road, Lochwinnoch, PA12 4NB,
77. Ian S Hunter, House of Greens, Dochcarty, Dingwall, IV15 9UF,
78. Meghan Hunter, 3F1, 18 East Preston Street, Edinburgh, EH8 9QB,
79. Susanne Hunter, House Of Greens, Dochcarty, Dingwall, IV15 9UF,
80. Fiona Irwin, Flat 311 13A Broomhill Drive, Glasgow, G11 7NB,
81. Berwick Johnson, 2 Duke Street, Cromarty, IV11 8YN,
82. Rachael Irvine, 41 Redwood Avenue, Inverness, IV2 6HA,
83. Gill Johnson, 2 Duke Street, Cromarty,
84. Seamus Keating, 407 , 8 Dundasvale Court , Glasgow, G4 0JG,
85. Caroline Keith, 1 Redfield Farm Cottage, Kessock, Inverness, IV1 3YD,
86. Heather A Kelman, Morven , Kingswell , Aberdeen, AB51,
87. Ellie Kenton, 7C Redwood Avenue, Milton Of Leys, Inverness, IV2 6HA,
88. S Kerr, 2 The Stables, Terregles Park , Terregles, Dumfries, DG2,
89. Lois Macgeachy, 34 Norwood Drive, Giffrock , Glasgow , G41 7LS,
90. Sharon A O'Donnell, 25 Beechgrove Avenue, Aberdeen , AB15 5HE,
91. Seonaid McLachlan, 515 8L Templeton Street, Glasgow , G40 1EE,
92. Andrew McConnell, 90 Lonaen Road, Glasgow, G1 5DE,
93. Derek Michael, 6 Makbrar Wynd, Dumfries, DG1 4XD,
94. Mrs S Moore, Craggiemore Farm, Craggie, Daviot, Inverness, IV2 5XQ,
95. John H Munro, 99 Hunterfield Rod, Gonebridge , EH23 4TS,
96. Alistair Neill, 3 Machan Avenue, Larkhall, ML9 3HE,
97. Valerie Ritchie, 88 Stoffield Road, Lossiemouth,
98. K Sinclair, Tanglewood, Whitebridge, Inverness, IV2 6UR,
99. Mr Dean Cunningham, 6 Dornie Place, Inverness, IV2 4BX,
100. Mr Brian MacGregor, Bogbain Farmhouse, Inverness, IV2 5BD,
101. Mr Daniel Mclean, 33 Assynt Road, Kinmylies, Inverness, IV3 8PB,
102. Mr Fred Milwood, Burnside, 13B Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QN, ,
103. Mr Alexander Kidd, 16 Boswell Road, Inverness, IV2 3EJ,
104. Ms Eilidh Willoughby, 6 Inshes Mews, Inverness, IV2 5HY,

105. Ian and Gail MacDonald, 8 Holm Mills Road, Inverness, IV2 4RA,
106. John Smarket, 70 Braes of Conon, Conon Bridge, Dingwall, IV7 8AX,
107. Hazel Smith, 47 Firthview Drive, Inverness, IV3 8NS,
108. I M Smith, 12 Newton Gate, Nairn, IV12 4TS,
109. Smith, The Steading, Craigmyle , Torphins, Banchory , AB31 4LS,
110. Bryan Steel, 81 Polmuir Road, Aberdeen, AB11 7SJ,
111. Rowan L Stevenson, Dalmore House, Auchendinny, Penicuik, EH26 0ND,
112. H Stewart, Black Barony Homefarm, Eddleston, Peebles, EH45 8QW,
113. Joel Tracey, 86 Leadsie Road, Aberdeen, AB25 3TU,
114. Gordon R Urquhart, 29 Jordanhill Crescent, Glasgow, G13 1UN,
115. Carol A Wallace, 27 Westerbank Park, Oldmeldrum , Inverurie, AB51 0DG,
116. Mr S Wood, 3 Provost Smith Crescent, Inverness, IV2 3TG,
117. Mr Oliver Macdonald-Haig, 4 Huntly terrace, Inverness, IV3 5PS,
118. Mr C Montroy, 140/8 Bonnington Road, Edinburgh, EH6 5JP,
119. Dr David Crippin, 12 Culduthel Gardens, Inverness, IV2 4AR,
120. Mr Tony Perridge, 29 Attadale Road, Inverness, IV3 5QH,
121. Mrs Moira Murray, Hebrides, 120a Glenurquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5TD,
122. Mr Angus McMaster, 18 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
123. Mr David Edes, 44, Brudes Hill, Inverness, IV3 8AG,
124. Mr Richard Newmark, 27 Bellfield Park, Inverness, IV2 4TA,
125. Mr Colin Craig, The Farr End, Culduthel Road, Inverness, IV2 4BH,
126. Ms Jennifer Macfie, Lower Drumbuie, Drumnadrochit, Inverness, IV63 6XP,
127. Mr Steven Hutchison, 43, Muirfield road, Inverness, IV2 4AY,
128. Mr Richard Allan, 27 Evan Barron Road, Inverness, IV2 4JE,
129. Mrs Deannie McMaster, 18 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
130. Mrs Lyndsay Fraser, 80 Smithton Park, Inverness, IV2 7PB,
131. Mr George Burgess, 29 Southside Road, Inverness, IV2 4XA,
132. Mrs Lisa Burnside, Tasarinan, 49 Cedarwood Drive, Milton of Leys, IV2 6GU,
133. Mr Alastair MacKenzie, 26 Hilton Crescent, Inverness, IV2 3DJ,
134. Mrs Hazel Newlands, Rhiannon, Arthurville Court, Tain, IV19 1PW,
135. Mr George Burgess, 29 Southside Road, Inverness, IV2 4XA,
136. Mrs Alice Crowther, 3 Midmils Road, Inverness, IV2 3NZ,
137. Miss Linsey Sinclair, 37 Union Road, Crown, Inverness, IV2 3JY,
138. Mr Roy Sinclair, Tordarroch, Belmaduthy, Munloch, IV8 8PF,
139. Mrs Lesley Hamilton, 199 Drumossie Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3SN,
140. Mr Derek Munro, Eriskay, Lower Muckovie, Milton Of Leys - Bogbain - Castlehill Road, Inshes, Inverness, Highland, IV2 5BB,
141. Mr Stanley Fraser, Toll House 16 Clachnaharry Road, Inverness, IV3 8QH,
142. Great Glen Canal Users Association, David Edes, Chairman, 44 Brudes Hill, Inverness, IV3 8AG
143. Mrs Joanne Philip, 4 Upper Slackbuie, Inverness, IV2 6BY,
144. Mr Brodie McMaster, 18 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
145. Mrs Lorraine MacDonald, 73 Braeside Park, Balloch, Inverness, IV2 7HN,
146. Mr Calum Munro, 55 Laggan Road, Inverness, IV2 4EP,
147. Mrs Katie Smith, Gorthleck House, Gorthleck, Inverness, IV2 6UJ,
148. Mr and Mrs Mark and Alison Tait, 31B Old Mill Lane, Inverness, IV2 3XP,
149. Mr Arran McMaster, 18 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
150. Mrs Jacqueline Elmslie, 7 Harris Road, Inverness, IV2 3LS,
151. Mr Gordon Brown, 9 Bellfield Park, Inverness, IV2 4SZ, ,
152. Mrs Carole Chisholm, 33 Charles St, Crown, Inverness, IV2 3AH,
153. Mr Scott Brown, 5 Creag Dhuhb Terrace, Inverness, Highland, IV3 8QG,
154. Ms Sheena Williamson, IV3 8RR, Inverness, IV3 8RR,
155. Mrs Barbara Henderson, 30 Argyle Street, Inverness, IV2 3BB,
156. Mr Simon Varwell, 14 Innes Street, Inverness, IV1 1NS,
157. Ms Gill O'Connell, 27 Ballifeary Road, Inverness, IV3 5PJ,

158. Mr Andrew Johnston, 9 Cedarwood Drive, Inverness, IV2 6GU,
159. Mr Edward Mackenzie, 52 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3QG,
160. Mr Sam Freck, Flat 1/2, 61 White Street, Glasgow, G11 5EG,
161. Mr Donald MacKenzie, 52 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3QG,
162. Ms Sheena Williamson, IV3 8RR, Inverness, IV3 8RR,
163. Mr Robert Roberts, 60 Cedarwood Drive, Milton of Leys, Inverness, IV2 6GU,
164. Mr George Livingstone, 11 Larch Place, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7LD,
165. Mrs Fiona MacAllister, 23 Grigor Drive, INVERNESS, IV2 4LP,
166. Mrs Gwyneth Scott, 6 Lower Balmacaan, Drumnadrochit, IV63 6WU,
167. Mr and Mrs Hugh Grant, 36 Swanston Avenue, Inverness, IV3 8QW,
168. Andy Wilson, 24 Culloden Park, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7AY,
169. Barry Allan, 26 Holm Farm Road, Culduthel, Inverness, IV2 6BE,
170. David Cameron, 2 Forestry Cottages, Moy, Tomatin, Inverness, IV13 7YQ,
171. Daniel Patterson, 34 Mains Avenue, Invergordon, IV18 0JT,
172. Donald MacRitchie, Woodlands, Upper Faillie, Daviot, Inverness, IV2 6WG,
173. M and Thomas Wylie, 5 Torness Road, Inverness, IV2 4RH,
174. David S Thomson, 58 Castleton Village, Inverness, IV2 6GY,
175. Donald Morrison, Blairdhu, Muir of Ord, IV6 7RT,
176. Mr and Mrs D MacLennan, 27 Miller Street, Inverness, IV2 3DN,
177. A and L MacSween, 11 Burn Brae, Inverness, IV2 5RH,
178. James MacLennan, 8 Culloden Road, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5BJ,
179. Norman Mackenzie, 33 West Heather Gardens, Inverness, IV2 4DZ,
180. G and K Skinner, 71 Firthview Drive, Inverness, IV3 8NS,
181. Diarmid Mitchell, 4 Young Court, Rosemarkie, Fortrose, IV10 8UY,
182. Mr Angus And Mrs Jane Campbell, Rowanbank, 20 Ballifeary Road, Inverness, IV3 5PJ,
183. John Beattie, 100 Laurel Avenue, Inverness, IV3 5RR,
184. Mr Kevin Sinclair, 35 Townlands Park, Cromarty, IV11 8YY,
185. Ms Anna Davidson, 7 Dunain Road, Inverness, IV3 5LR,
186. Mrs Mary-Anne Hogg, 27 Rosshill Drive, Maryburgh, IV7 8EH,
187. Westhill Community Council c/o Dr Donald Boyd, Ebenezer, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5JY,
189. Mr John Johnson, 19 Burn Brae Avenue, Inverness, Highland, IV2 5RG,
190. Mr A Hunter, 16 Greenwod Gardens, Inverness, IV2 6GP,
191. Mrs Doreen Campbell, Taclair, Munloch, IV8 8NZ,
192. Dr Fiona Hamilton, 20 Shandon Place, Edinburgh, EH11 1QL,
193. Mr William Gillespie, 43 Holm Dell Avenue, Inverness, IV24GW,
194. Mr James Kidd, 6 Firthview Drive, Inverness, IV3 8NS,
195. Mr Dan Tierney, 32c Hill Street, Inverness, IV2 3AN,
196. Mr William Mein, 11, Beaufort Road, Inverness, IV2 3NP,
197. Mr Alan Coutts, Craggie Farm, Daviot, Inverness, IV2 5XQ,
198. Mr Alasdair Murray, 120a Glenurquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5TD,
199. Mrs Sue Pirnie, Woodhill, Brae of Balnabeen, Conon Bridge, IV7 8JA,
200. Mr C. Spence, 30 Braeside Park, Inverness, IV2 7HL,
201. Mrs Lorna Henderson, 17 Cullaird Road, Lochardil, Inverness, IV2 4DL,
202. Mr Frederick Geddes, Newtonhill, Lentrane, Inverness, IV3 8RN,
203. Mr Donald Matheson, 34 Rangemore Road, Inverness, IV35EA,
204. Mr James MacLennan, 36 Towerhill Gardens, Cradlehall, Inverness, IV2 5FR,
205. Mr Andrew MacDonald, Eskadale, 74 Ballifeary Road, Inverness, IV3 5PF,
206. Mr Donnie Macdonald, 28 Ord Place, Muir of Ord, IV67TS,
207. Mrs Jennifer Mayhew, 28 Drummond Circus, Inverness, IV2 4QP,
208. Miss Trish Macdonald, 16 Teal Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3TB,
209. Mr Fergus MacKenzie, 52 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3QG,
210. Ms Phyllis MacLean, 48 Castle Heather Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4DR,
211. Mr Peter MacKenzie, 41 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3QQ,
212. Miss Moira Maclean, 1 Holm Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4QZ, ,
213. Mr Duncan Simpson, 5 Firstfield Avenue, North Kessock, IV1 3JB,

214. Ms Ferga Perry, West lodge, Achnagairn, Inverness, IV5 7PD,
215. Mr Toby Stainton, 17 Balvonie Street, Milton of Leys, Inverness, IV2 6GF,
216. Mr Ron McAndrew, 23 Leachkin Road, Inverness, IV3 8NN,
217. Mrs Debby MacDonald, 108 Anderson Street, Invernesd, IV3 8DX,
218. Rona Mackintosh, 17 Glengarry Road, Inverness, IV3 8NJ
219. Jamie Caine, 17 Raigmore Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3UW,
220. Robert Lucas, 5 Wade's Circle, Inverness, IV2 5JG,
221. Kevin MacLeod, 29 Hazel Avenue, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7JX,
222. Lorraine MacPherson, 45 Castle Heather Road, Inverness, IV2 4EA,
223. Mairi Ross, 82 Hazel Avenue, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7WS,
224. A Mackenzie, 12 Drummond Road, Inverness, IV2 4NB,
225. Mark Simpson, C/o Dingbro , 135 Rosehaugh Road, South Kessock,
226. Steven McDonald, 166 Castle Heather Drive, Inverness, IV2 4ED,
227. Gavin Anderson, 80 Scorguie Drive, Inverness, IV3 8SG,
228. Donald Mackintosh, 69 Walker Crescent, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7LZ,
229. Vicky Ross, 9 Admirals Way, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5GT,
230. A I Macgregor, 35 Nevis Park, Inverness, IV3 8RX,
231. Mr Richard Castro, Glenside, Merlewood Road, Inverness, IV2 4NL,
232. Mr David Mason, Ballindarroch Cottage, Scaniport, Inverness, IV2 6DL,
233. Mr R. D. MacLeod, Polisard, Lonemore, Gairloch, IV21 2DA,
234. Mrs Dianne Mckay, 160,Culduthel road, Inverness, IV24BH,
235. Mr Mark Ireland, 50 Harrowden Road, Inverness, IV3 5QN,
236. Mr Graham Nisbet, Balniaban, Drumbuie, Drumnadrochit, IV63 6UX,
237. Mr Steve Syme, 77 Boundary Brook Road, Oxford, OX4 4AL,
238. Mrs Margaret Mackintosh, 48B Park Street, Nairn, IV12 4PW,
239. Mr Mark Lazzeri, 1 Quayside Cottages, Amhuinnsuidhe, HS3 3AS,
240. Mr Martin Sellar, 15a Ballifeary Road, Inverness, IV3 5PJ,
241. Mr Vic Blake, 25 Holm Park, Holm Park, INVERNESS, IV2 4XT,
242. Miss Angela Mapplebeck, 60 East Mackenzie Park, Inverness, IV23SS,
243. Mr Adam McMaster, 18 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
244. Mr Douglas Stewart, Kaliji, Holm Mills Road, Inverness, IV2 4RA,
245. Duncan MacPherson, 19 Towerhill Avenue, Cradlehall, Inverness, IV2 5FX,
246. Mrs Isla, Alexander J And Andrew Davidson, Wayside, Croy, Inverness, IV2 5PR,
247. Mr A G Stewart, 59 Drakies Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3SD,
248. David and Olna Graham, 8 Toll Road, Avoch, IV9 8PR,
249. Mrs D Fraser, Tign Na Bhean, Dochgarroch , Inverness, IV3 8JG,
250. Sheilah Ramsey, 29 Harris Road, Inverness, IV2 3LS,
251. Mr Archie Douglas, Glenearne, 160 Culduthel Road, Inverness, IV2 4BH,
252. Jean R B Munro, 21 Cameron Square, Inverness, IV3 8PY,
253. Mr and Mrs Main, 4 Cullaird Road, Inverness, IV2 4DL,
254. Mr John and Catherine Imlack, 13 Garth Road, Inverness, IV2 4DA,
255. Brian Rizza, Blairlomond, 11 Drummond Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4QW,
256. Mr and Mrs Paterson, 15 Moray Drive, Balloch, Inverness, IV2 7HS,
257. Rhona Hunter, 68 Laggan Road, Inverness, IV2 4EW,
258. Neil and Anne Yule, 44 Moray Park Wynd, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7FZ,
259. Mr W A E Fraser, Balwearie, Drummond Road, Inverness, IV2 4NA,
260. Alex J MacDonald, 100A Old Evanton Road, Inverness, IV2 3HT,
261. A Clunas, 32 Heatherley Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4AW,
262. Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd, Per: Ian Kelly, Graham and Sibbald,
263. Mr Iain MacGillivray, 41 Glenurquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5NZ,
264. Mr Roderick Ross, 25 Torr gardens, Dores, Inverness, IV2 6TS,
265. Mr Stephen Peasnell, Rossal House, 31 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QS,
266. Mr Duncan Fraser, 25 Stratherrick Road, Inverness, IV2 4LF,
267. Mr Gregor MacKenzie, 23a Pittodrie Place, Aberdeen, AB24 5QR,
268. Mr Dennis MacRae, 6Forbes Place, Smithton, Inverness, IV2 7NN,

269. Dr Ronald Wallace, 27 Westerbank Park, Oldmeldrum, AB51 0DU,
270. A Waliter, Address incomplete,
271. Zac Weisz, Grant House, Pollock Halls, Edinburgh, EH16 5AY,
272. N G Allan, 11 Primrose Street, Dumfries, DG2 7AU,
273. Ian White, Flat 4 , 12 Orswell Place , Edinburgh, EH11 2AE,
274. Robert Young, 88 Stotfield Road, Lossiemouth, IV31 6QT,
275. Richard Ruane, New Arr Croft, Lethen, Nairn, IV12 5QJ,
276. R G Chalmers, 2 Trentham Court, Inverness, IV2 5DF,
277. Kathleen MacLennan, 11 Hilton Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4TJ,
278. J H Williams, 91 Ashton Road, Inverness, IV2 3UY,
279. Michael Rigby, 8 Westfield Walk, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5AJ,
280. Kenny Matheson, Milton, Adersider, By Inverness,
281. Pat Scott, 10 Devlin Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4LH,
282. Mrs Joan Mckay, Id-Dar Taghna, Inchmore, Kirkhill, Inverness, IV5 7PX,
283. Mr John Wood, Croylo Cottage, Stuarton , Ardersier, Inverness, IV2 7QH,
284. Robert and Christina Mitchell, 9 Priory Place, Beauly, IV4 7GB,
285. Mr and Mrs H Barclay, 50 Old Perth Road, Inverness, IV2 3RL,
286. Mr G MacDonald, Rosedale, Balvaird Road, Muir Of Ord, IV6 7RQ,
287. John Drummond, Littlecote, Chattan Drive, Nairn, IV12 4QR,
288. Mr and Mrs McIntosh, Address Incomplete,
289. Mr K Fernie, 8 Drakies Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3RW,
290. Fred and Jean Millwood, Burnside, 13B Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QN,
291. Mr L MacDonald, Heisgeir, Slackbuie Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4QH,
292. A G Mackenzie, 51 Lochiel Road, Inverness, IV2 3BY,
293. Mr Eion Fraser, 13 Craigard Terrace, Inverness, IV3 8PS,
294. Dr M W M Hadley, Orrin Lodge, 46 Culduthel Road, Inverness, IV2 4HQ,
295. Donald A Munro, The Gables, 6A Wester Greengate, Fortrose, IV10 8RX,
296. Daniel Sutherland, 88 Laggan Road, Inverness, IV2 4EP,
297. J Paterson, 26 Achvraid Road, Inverness, IV2 4LE,
298. Ian D and Hazel Fraser, Tigh An Eillan, 38 Island Bank Road, Inverness, IV2 4QT,
299. Mr and Mrs Leslie, 92 Drumossie Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3SX,
300. Mrs E MacDonald, 19 Crown Street, Inverness, IV2 3AX,
301. Mrs E MacPherson, 25 Telford Street, Inverness, IV3 5JZ,
302. J Munro, 16 Crown Street, Inverness, IV2 3AX,
303. Mr and Mrs A Bowman, 17 Crown Street, Inverness, IV2 3AX,
304. Paul and Liz Bowman, 76 Columba Road, Inverness, IV3 5HG,
305. Angus Noble, 24 Percival Road, Inverness, IV3 5QE,
306. John Walls, Silverstone, 31 Braeside Park, Balloch, Inverness, IV2 7HN,
307. P A Fraser, 1 Balnacraig Road, Inverness, IV3 5LN,
308. Mr B Case, Dalanloch, Balnain, Drumnadrochit, Inverness, IV63 6TJ,
309. Donnie Mackintosh, 11 Torr Gardens, Dores, Inverness, IV2 6TS,
310. Mr B Macleod, Woodside, 5 Redwood Court, Inverness, IV2 6HD,
311. Kenny, Debra And Ashley MacLennan, 102 Ardness Place, Inverness, IV2 4QY,
312. Grahame Macbeath, 8 Dalneigh Road, Inverness, IV3 5AH,
313. Malcolm Fraser, Rydal, Crown Circus, Inverness, IV2 3NQ,
314. E C Miller, 130 Culduthel Park, Inverness, IV2 4RZ,
315. Gordon D Scott, 10 Devlin Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4LH,
316. Mrs M Murdoch, Craigdarroch, 22 Green Drive, Inverness, IV2 4EU,
317. Dueald Stuart and Ann Mackay, Kincardine, Culloden Road, Inverness, IV2 5EE,
318. Heather Hodge, 57 Caledonian Road, Inverness, IV3 5RF,
319. Mrs R M Morrison, Mrs R M Morrison, 1 Cradlehall Park, Inverness, IV2 5BZ,
320. Colin Mckenzie, 15 Old Mill Road, Inverness, IV2 3HR,
321. Peter Oliver, 8 Balmoral Terrace, Inverness, IV2 3UU,
322. Arthur Ferguson, 22 Aird Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4TR,
323. J Michael P Bedard, 8 Overton Avenue, Inverness, IV3 8RR,

324. Mr and Mrs G Calder, 11 Redwood Court, Inverness, IV2 6HD,
325. Iain and Linda Mackay, 1 Laggan Road, Inverness, IV2 4EH,
326. Evan Macrae, The Willows, 21A Harris Road, Inverness, IV2 3LS,
327. Steve Barclay, 11 Caulfield Gardens, Cradlehall, Inverness, IV2 5GE,
328. W J Campbell, Ness Side Lodge, Dores Road, Inverness, IV2 6DH,
329. William and Chris Smith, 25 Culduthel Mains Circle, Culduthel, Inverness, IV2 6RH,
330. L Smith, 7 Culduthel Mains Circle, Culduthel, Inverness, IV2 6RH,
331. George Cunningham, 18 Old Mill Road, Inverness, IV2 3HR,
332. Albert McNeil, Green Acres, Highfield, Muir Of Ord, IV6 7UL,
333. Major and Mrs A Henderson, 23 Swanston Avenue, Inverness, IV3 8QW,
334. R A Glover, 10 Wellside Road, Balloch, Inverness, IV2 7GS,
335. John Ross, Cromal Bank, Ardersier, Inverness, IV2 7QZ,
336. Ian J Fraser, Burnaby, 6 Old Mill Lane, Inverness, IV2 3XP,
337. R Paterson, 95 Fairfield Road, Inverness, IV3 5LL,
338. Mr D Fraser, 10 Essich Gardens, Inverness, IV2 6BW,
339. Ward Balfour, 36 Firthview Road, Inverness, IV3 8LZ,
340. Murray Balfour, 15 Scorguie Avenue, Inverness, IV3 8SD,
341. Cliff and Alison Sim, Deveron, 26 Uist Road, Inverness, IV2 3LZ,
342. R Munro, 35 Drumfield Road, Inverness, IV2 4XH,
343. Bob and Margaret Pottie, 33 Lodgehill Park, Nairn, IV12 4SB,
344. John Maciver, 33 Dunain Road, Inverness, IV3 5LR,
345. Cam Macleay, 44 Scorguie Road, Inverness, IV3 8QP,
346. Donald McCuish, Arrochar, 59 Cedarwood Drive, Inverness, IV2 6GU,
347. E Fraser, Baileorigh, Meikle Phoineas, Beauly, IV4 7AY,
348. Andrew J Fraser, Meikle Phoineas, Beauly, IV4 7AY,
349. Sheila F MacDonald, Spring Cottage, 51 Old Perth Road, Inverness, IV2 3UP,
350. John Macleod, Tign Na Drochit, Daviot , IV2 6NN,
351. Samantha Gilham, 34 Boswell Road, Inverness, IV2 3EJ,
352. David and Paula Rennie, Eight Acres, Farr, Inverness, IV2 6XG,
353. Kevin Campbell, 10 Wester Inshes Crescent, Inverness, IV2 5HL,
354. Sandy Davidson, 26 Eastfield Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3RR,
355. Brian Mclean, 20 Holm Dell Court, Inverness, IV2 4GY,
356. James McNair, 68 Drakies Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3RT,
357. Jacqui Tuson-Webb, 3 Bishops View, Inverness,
358. Ms Claire MacKinnon, 22 Lomond Way, Inverness, IV3 8NZ,
359. Mr Douglas McAndrew, Fergus Court, Inverness, IV3 5JW,
360. Mr John West, 37 Drumdevan Road, Lochardil, Inverness, IV2 4DB,
361. Sir Ian MacNaughton, 80 Hilton Court, Hilton, Inverness, IV2 4JW,
362. Mr Jim Alexander, 49, Ashton Crescent, Inverness, IV2 3UZ,
363. David Carslan, 10 Cradlehall Meadows, Cradlehall, Inverness, IV2 5GD,
364. Rebecca Webb, 81 Lochalsh Road, Inverness, IV3 5QR,
365. Paul Mcintosh, 32 Bishop's View, Inverness, IV3 8LJ,
366. Mr H Macdougall, 13 Blarmore Avenue, Inverness, IV3 8QT,
367. Alistair McDonald, 44 Wade Road, Inverness, IV2 3DG,
368. Stuart Forrest, 32 Hilton Court, Inverness, IV2 4JP,
369. Adrian VcMaitre, 19 Trentham Drive, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 5TQ,
370. David Scobbin, 10 Kestrel Place, Inverness, IV2 3YH,
371. Sandy MacDonald, 35 Wellside Road, Balloch, Inverness, IV2 7GS,
372. Garry Park, 3 Dell Road, Inverness, IV2 4UD,
373. Mr G F Nicol, 53 Tomnahurich Street, Inverness, IV3 5DT,
374. Barry Butcher, 2 Woodlands Brae, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5JH,
375. A Campbell, Lochsherrif Croft, Culbokie, Dingwall, IV7 8JJ,
376. John Mackay, 65 Castle Heather Crescent, Inverness, IV2 4BF,
377. M A Wiltshire, 121 Smithton Park, Smithton, Inverness, IV2 7PE,
378. Craig MacDonald, 29 Warrand Road, Inverness, IV3 5SH,

379. Frank Murray, 12A Firhill, Alness, IV17 0RS,
380. S Robertson, 88 OldTown Road, Hilton, Inverness, IV7 4PG,
381. Alan Stewart, 8 Woodlands Way, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5DN,
382. Colin Abraham, Flat 1, Gollanfield House, Ardersier, Inverness, IV2 7QP,
383. Donald Macleod, Crisdon, Leachkin Road, Inverness, IV3 8NW,
384. Mrs Emma Folan, Craigview, East Terrace, Kingussie, PH21 1JS,
385. Mrs Val Falconer, 71 Old Edinburgh Road, Inverness, IV2 3PG,
386. Highland Rugby Football Club, Per Andrew Russell, Honorary Secretary, Highland Rugby Football Club, 9 Crown Circus, Inverness, IV2 3NU,
387. Inverness Rowing Club, Per: Roy Sinclair, Hon President, Tordarroch, Belmaduthy, Munloch, Ross-shire, IV8 8PF,
388. Lorna Reynolds, 49 Old Evanton Road, Dingwall, IV15 9RB,
389. Mr Peter Davies, Foinavew, Ardross, Alness, IV17 0XN,
390. Julia Grant, 81B Towerhill Crescent, Inverness, IV2 5GZ,
391. Mr Ben Cheetham, 39 Wellside Road, Balloch, Inverness, IV2 7GS,
392. Etta Renganan, 1 Farm Home Cottages, Gollanfield,
393. Mr Ian Campbell, 109 Drumossie Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3SQ,
394. John F Kay, 30 Hilton Court, Inverness, IV2 4JP,
395. A G Mitchell, 5 Seaton Cottages, The Dock, Avoch, Ross-shire, IV9 8QE,
396. Mrs Sarah Macphail, 61 Lilac Grove, Inverness, IV3 5RE,
397. Miss Moira Maclean, 1, Holm Avenue, Inverness, IV24qz,
398. Smithton & Culloden Community Council c/o Mr David McGrath Chair 151 Galloway Drive, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7LP,
399. Mrs Margot Kerr, The Birks 2 Drummond Place, Inverness, Highland, IV2 4JT,
400. Miss Elizabeth Morrison, 23 Kincaig Terrace, Inverness, IV3 8RP,
401. Mr William Munro, 2 Dellness Ave, Inverness, IV2 5HE,
402. Mr Ian MacKenzie, 11 Green Drive, Inverness, IV2 4EX,
403. Inverness Civic Trust, Per: John West, 37 Drumdevan Road, Lochardil, Inverness, IV2 4LU,
404. Mrs C Smith, Cardon, Balnafoich, Farr, Inverness, IV2 6XG, ,
405. Mr J R Macdonald, 28 Heatherley Crescent, Inverness, Highland, IV2 4AW,
406. Mr George Sim, 80 Kingsmills Road, Inverness, IV2 3LL,
407. Ms Anne Jackson, 27 Bellfield Park, Inverness, IV2 4TA,
408. Mr Martin Mcgrath, 26 Lomond Way, Inverness, IV3 8NZ,
409. Mr Donald McColl, 66 Scorguie Drive, Inverness, IV3 8SG,
410. Mr Liam Shand, 1 Iona Road, Inverness, IV3 8LY,
411. Mr Hamish Milne, 17 Broom Drive, Inverness, IV2 4EG,
412. J Lorrain-Smith, Parkgate, 78 Kingsmills Road, Inverness, IV2 3LL,
413. Mr James Ogilvie, 22 Newton Park, Kirkhill, Inverness, IV57QB,
414. Mrs Diane Sutherland, 9 Raasay Road, Inverness, IV2 3LR,
415. Mr & Mrs Thomas & Isabel Macintyre, 46, Swanston Avenue, Inverness, IV 3 8QW,
416. Mrs Fiona Nisbet, Balnaban, Drumbuie, Drumnadrochit, IV63 6UX,
417. Mr Donald Waters, 5, Sandalwood Avenue, Inverness, IV2 6GR,
418. Mr Richard Crawford, Druid House, Old Edinburgh Road South, Inverness, IV2 6AR,
419. Mr Paul Gallagher, 58 Lawers Way, In verness, IV3 8NU,
420. Mrs Samantha Mackenzie, 152 Hazel Avenue, Culloden, Inverness, IV2 7WS,
421. Mr Graham Tuley, 26 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3NL,
422. Mr Steven Bell, 10 Tudor Court, 157 High St, Egham, TW20 9HZ,
423. Mrs Isabelle MacKenzie, 52 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3QG,
424. Mr John MacKenzie, 52 Crown Drive, Inverness, IV2 3QG,
425. Mr Brian Stockdale, 2 Boarstone Avenue, Inverness, IV2 4XW,
426. Mr John Urquhart, 122 Glenurquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5TD,
427. Mr Robin Andrew, 13 Charleston Place, Inverness, IV3 8NB,
428. Mrs Margaret MacKenzie, 11 Green Drive, Inverness, IV2 4EX,
429. Mr Jan Adamiec, 10 Leachkin Park, Inverness, IV3 8RU,
430. Scottish Rowing Centre, 366 Hamilton Road, Motherwell, ML1 3ED

SUPPORTERS

1. Mrs Jacqueline Smith, Cuddy's Well, Clephanton, Inverness, IV2 7QS