

Agenda Item	13
Report No	ECI/19/25

The Highland Council

Committee: Economy and Infrastructure

Date: 29 May 2025

Report Title: Development Plan Delivery

Report By: Assistant Chief Executive - Place

1 Purpose/Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out how the Council can best deliver its existing and future development plans. Successful delivery depends upon maximising and coordinating investment and accurate monitoring of that investment to make sure it happens in the right place, at the right time and yields its intended benefits.
- 1.2 Three key tools are available to assist successful delivery; the Highland Delivery Programme (HDP), the Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline (DHLP) for Highland, and Masterplan Consent Areas (MCAs). This report explains and seeks Committee endorsement of progress with each tool.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to:-
 - i. **Agree** the changes to the Highland Delivery Programme listed at Appendix 2 in response to comments made on its public consultation draft;
 - ii. Following committee and prior to publication, **agree** that the Assistant Chief Executive – Place, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee, make further factual and update changes to the Programme;
 - iii. **Note** progress in better defining the deliverability of Highland’s housing land supply as set out in the Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline at Appendix 3;
 - iv. **Agree** that the criteria listed at paragraph 8.2 be applied to potential MCA sites/locations to select those which will be subject to further feasibility work, consultation with affected community bodies and landowners, and subsequent Committee consideration and approval; and
 - v. **Note** and discuss the options described in section 8 and at Appendix 4 of the report for Masterplan Consent Area governance and process.

3 Implications

- 3.1 **Resource** – this report does not make investment decisions but better informs those that do. The Highland Delivery Programme (HDP) promotes the spatial and temporal coordination of the Council’s capital programme (including its Highland Investment Plan component) with those of other public agencies and the private development industry (via direct investment and developer contributions) to make the public (and private) pound go further. The Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline (DHLP) provides advanced indication of the constraints to meeting our housing targets, including infrastructure requirements, indicating where investment should be made. A Masterplan Consent Area (MCA) is a tool to unlock and coordinate investment for a particular place.
- 3.2 **Legal** – there is legal duty to consult with any agency named in a delivery programme. This requirement was met. Scottish Government required that each council submit a copy of its delivery programme and DHLP by 31 March 2025. Copies were supplied. The finalised HDP must be sent to Scottish Government and published. Each Council must formally consider the use of MCAs at least every 5 years. The Council published an MCA Statement in July 2024. It should be noted that the Council has no planning policy remit within the Cairngorms National Park boundary and therefore the HDP and DHLP do not reference that part of Badenoch and Strathspey. The Council cannot take forward an MCA within the Park boundary.
- 3.3 **Risk** - there may a reputational and stakeholder cooperation risk to the Council if it does not follow a logical, transparent and coordinated process in making infrastructure investment decisions. The Infrastructure Commission for Scotland Report explains the optimum process.
- 3.4 **Health and Safety (risks arising from changes to plant, equipment, process, or people)** – No implications.
- 3.5 **Gaelic** – The finalised documentation will include Gaelic headings and subheadings in accordance with the Council’s Gaelic Language Plan.

4 Impacts

- 4.1 In Highland, all policies, strategies or service changes are subject to an integrated screening for impact for Equalities, Poverty and Human Rights, Children’s Rights and Wellbeing, Climate Change, Islands and Mainland Rural Communities, and Data Protection. Where identified as required, a full impact assessment will be undertaken.
- 4.2 Considering impacts is a core part of the decision-making process and needs to inform the decision-making process. When taking any decision, Members must give due regard to the findings of any assessment.

4.3 Integrated Impact Assessment - Summary

- 4.3.1 An Integrated Impact Assessment screening has been undertaken on 6 May 2025. The conclusions have been subject to the relevant Manager Review and Approval as detailed in **Appendix 1**.
- 4.3.2 The Screening process has concluded that no Integrated Impact Assessment is needed. Members are asked to consider the summary below to support the decision-making process.

Impact Assessment Area	Conclusion of Screening & Assessment
Equality	no impact
Socio-economic	no impact
Human Rights	no impact
Children's Rights and Well-being	no impact
Island and Mainland Rural	no impact
Climate Change	no impact
Data Rights	no impact

5 Background

- 5.1 Committee will recall its approval of a draft HDP and draft DHLP for the Inner Moray Firth area at its 22 August 2024 meeting. The implications section above explains the purpose and importance of these two documents and MCAs. The potential role of MCAs in Highland was considered by Committee at its meeting of 2 May 2024.
- 5.2 Since then, further work and consultation has been undertaken to refine these three delivery tools. First, the HDP has been subject to public consultation. Perhaps understandably, as a long, factual document few comments were received (summarised below and detailed **at Appendix 2**). However, there is also an ongoing dialogue with key funders and providers who are supplying factual updates of the infrastructure schemes within the Programme. Secondly, there is a similar, ongoing dialogue with the development industry, particularly with the volume housebuilders, as to the deliverability of land identified for housing in Highland. **Appendix 3** takes account of this input and provides the latest position. It is vital for monitoring and decision-making purposes that both the Programme and Pipeline are kept up to date. For example, the latest Housing Land Audit informs the DHLP and the latest school roll forecasts, which in turn inform developer contributions and capital programme decisions.
- 5.3 Thirdly, meetings with Scottish Government officials and other potential “early adopter” Councils have taken place as to the use of MCAs in Highland and elsewhere. The relevant secondary legislation on MCAs came into effect in December 2024 and Scottish Government issued guidance on MCAs in January 2025. Members will recall that one of the 6 commitments announced by the Council at the October 2024 Housing Summit was to prepare 3 MCAs by the end of June 2026.

6 Highland Delivery Programme (HDP)

- 6.1 An online six-week public consultation on the draft HDP was undertaken between August and October 2024. **Appendix 2** details the comments received, provides a written response to each, and recommends minor consequential amendments to the Programme. Comments referenced the relative prioritisation of community facility projects, the need for certain transport projects, the impact of developer contributions on developer viability, the need for better monitoring of a deliverable housing land supply, and the need for factual updates and corrections.
- 6.2 Several other factual and update changes will be required following Committee. The HDP lists infrastructure requirements and, where appropriate, specifies whether, where and when developer contributions will be sought towards those requirements. The list of infrastructure and contributions sought is subject to change as related policies, data and capital programme funding commitments change. For example, The Highland Council's meeting of 15 May 2025 is expected to agree changes to the Council's capital programme, which will need incorporated within the updated HDP before it is published. Similarly, recently updated population, housing and school roll forecasts have knock-on effects on what infrastructure is needed, when and who should help fund that investment.
- 6.3 The full, proposed, revised HDP will be available on the [Council's relevant webpage](#) from mid-May 2025. It will incorporate all the factual and update changes described above. For example, it will include the updated list of schools, within the catchments of which, we will seek developer contributions from housing developers and will specify the broad level of those contributions.

7 Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline (DHLP)

- 7.1 Related to the HDP, Scottish Ministers now require each planning authority to better demonstrate that it is meeting its housing target. This evidence should be a published Pipeline, which is to include the sequencing of, and timescale for, the delivery of all housing component sites allocated in the authority's local development plan(s) and/or with an extant planning permission. Members may recall that Highland's (excepting that portion of the Council's area that lies within the Cairngorms National Park) nationally set target is 9,500 units over 10 years albeit the October 2024 Housing Summit announced a far more ambitious target of 24,000 units over the same period.
- 7.2 The Pipeline for Highland is set out **at Appendix 3**. It covers only those sites with an extant housing capacity of 25 or more units. The housing land supply expected to be delivered by sites between 4 and 24 units is set out within the [2024 Housing Land Audit](#). An approximation of supply likely, if past trends continue, delivered by 1-3 unit developments is described on the [Council's Housing Land Information webpage](#). The Pipeline is subject to ongoing consultation with Homes for Scotland and the wider development industry and is intended as a "live" document because the landownership and planning status of sites changes frequently and these changes impact expected house completions.

As stated above, the Pipeline and wider expected house completion forecasts are crucial to informing the Council's school roll forecasts, developer contributions, capital programming and where, when and how much land should be identified for new housing development.

- 7.3 The headline is that Highland has a sufficient, deliverable housing land supply for the next 3-6 years relative to likely future housing need and demand but thereafter a variety of constraints, particular infrastructure capacity, will inhibit the achievement of our housing target. Solutions are a matter for separate Committee and Council decision and planning policy and development management decisions to allocate for and then permit further housing development in places where people want to live and where it is viable for the development industry to build.
- 7.4 In more detail, the 25+ unit sites are expected to deliver 2,513 units over the next 3 years and 6,147 over the next 6 years. Thereafter, only another 2,777 units are expected in years 7-10 inclusive. At least 4,700 potential housing units are tied to allocated housing sites which are not expected to deliver in the next 10 years. From the wider 2024 Housing Land Audit, 4-24 sites are expected to deliver 266 over years 1-3, 719 over years 1-6, and only a further 137 units over years 7-10 inclusive. From past trends (2018-2024 inclusive) small scale windfall development (1-3-unit developments on non-allocated land) delivered an average of 451 units per year over the period 2018-2024 inclusive. Relative to the 9,500 and 24,000 unit targets these three sources of housing land supply are expected to deliver 14,290 units over 10 years. There is a shortfall in deliverable sites, particularly from year 7 onwards. In the medium term, the new Highland Local Development Plan will need to address this shortfall by deallocating sites that are not delivering and identifying suitable, deliverable alternatives. In the short term, alternative delivery mechanisms such as MCAs should be considered.

8 Masterplan Consent Areas (MCAs)

- 8.1 Committee will recall from its May 2024 meeting that an MCA is a discretionary legal power for a council to unlock and accelerate a development site. An MCA, if and when “made” (adopted), removes the need for planning permission (and potentially other consents) but can specify conditions, limitations and exceptions to this streamlined approach. Committee in May 2024, agreed further to investigate the role of MCAs in Highland but without commitment, at that stage, to any specific site or location.

- 8.2 Following consideration of the now published secondary legislation and Scottish Government guidance, officers intend to sieve potential MCA sites/locations using the following criteria:-
- Has the site benefited from a development plan allocation or a planning permission?
 - Will development of the site result in a net increase in local employment and/or provide affordable housing units at a greater rate than required by existing Council policy?
 - Is the likely scale of development classified as major in the [relevant regulations](#)?
 - Is there current landowner and developer interest in pursuing development of the site?
 - Does the site lie outwith any international or national heritage designation?
 - Does the site lie outwith SEPA mapping defined future flood risk areas?
 - Is there any evidence of justified community support for, or opposition to, development of the site?
 - Is any key or other statutory agency likely to object to development of the site?
- 8.3 As part of progress in preparing a new, single Highland Local Development Plan a Call for Development Sites was issued in January 2025. The closing date for submissions was 2 May 2025. It has been made clear to the development industry that all larger scale submissions will be assessed as to their suitability as potential MCAs. A verbal update can be provided at Committee on the number of submissions and their potential as MCAs.
- 8.4 Members should note the risks and benefits of pursuing an MCA. From discussions with Scottish Government and other potential “early adopter” councils, Highland is the only council considering the use of an MCA for housing development on land that is neither allocated in the development plan nor has a previous or extant planning permission. As such there is a risk of legal challenge. However, there are also obvious benefits of unlocking and accelerating much needed economic and housing growth.
- 8.5 Scottish Government guidance suggests that an MCA should be initiated and adopted by a local planning authority, but its process, methodology and funding can be flexible provided it includes the statutory MCA stages and involves collaborative masterplanning by all parties (the Council, local community, landowners, developers, key agencies and other infrastructure providers). The guidance also supports the sharing of resources and expertise. This flexibility will allow the Council to tailor the process, and funding, for each MCA to the circumstances of the site, location and range of stakeholders.
- 8.6 Similarly, discretionary charging of landowners, developers and/or operators is available to recoup the cost of MCA preparation, process and discharging of any MCA conditions. The MCA “Scheme” must detail the costs/charges/fees intended to be recovered, their necessity and purpose, and how they will be apportioned.

- 8.7 The initial view of officers is that direct landowner, developer and/or operator funding of an MCA is preferable to the Council outlaying resources to undertake the work and then seeking cost recovery. Currently, for example, direct developer funded infrastructure capacity provision is faster and more cost efficient for the Council than seeking developer contributions to recoup monies for improvements such as schools or transport schemes forward funded by the Council.
- 8.8 The potential drawback of allowing the development industry to fund and lead preparation of an MCA is that its content may not be acceptable to the Council at approval or adoption stage. To reduce this risk, it is suggested, that at least one Council officer be “embedded” within the developer’s multi-disciplinary masterplanning team to input to and provide oversight of the preparation of that MCA.

9 Next Steps

- 9.1 Following Committee decision and any further factual updates, the HDP will be published and an electronic copy sent to Scottish Government and other interested parties.
- 9.2 The DHLP will be kept up to date and will, together with a new Housing Need and Demand Assessment presently being commissioned, be the crucial evidence in assessing whether Highland’s housing target will be met. If not, then alternative solutions will be needed.
- 9.3 Subject to Committee’s endorsement, MCAs present an alternative solution. Officers will progress further feasibility work in sieving potential sites and areas, which will be subject to future committee reporting and Member approval.

Designation: Assistant Chief Executive - Place

Date: 22 April 2025

Author: Tim Stott, Principal Planner
Swayamsidha Patra, Graduate Planner

Background Papers: Delivery Programme for IMFLDP2 [Report](#)
Masterplan Consent Area [Report](#)
Housing Land Audit [2024](#)
Revised Highland Delivery [Programme](#)
Masterplan Consent Areas [Guidance](#)

Appendices: Appendix 1 - Integrated Impact Assessment Screening
Appendix 2 - Highland Delivery Programme: Consultation
Comments and Recommended Council Response
Appendix 3 - Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline for
Highland
Appendix 4 - Masterplan Consent Areas: Suggested
Governance and Process

Integrated Impact Assessment Screening

About proposal

What does this proposal relate to? Action or delivery plan

Proposal name: Development Plan Delivery Committee Report

High level summary of the proposal: Update report to 29 May 2025 Economy and Infrastructure Committee about progress in Development Plan delivery.

Who may be affected by the proposal? No direct implications from the Report.

Start date of proposal: 29/05/2025

End date of proposal: 29/05/2026

Does this proposal result in a change or impact to one or more Council service? No

Does this relate to an existing proposal? Yes

Provide details of the existing proposal: The Committee Report provides a progress update on the Highland Delivery Programme, Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline and potential use of Masterplan Consent Areas in Highland.

Author details

Name: Tim Stott

Job title: Principal Planner

Email address: Tim.Stott@highland.gov.uk

Service: Place

Responsible officer details

Name: David Mudie

Job title: Strategic Lead - Planning and Building Standards

Email address: David.Mudie@highland.gov.uk

Sign off date: 2025-05-06

Equalities, poverty, and human rights

Protected characteristics

Select what impact the proposal will have on the following protected characteristics:

Sex: No impact

Age: No impact

Disability: No impact

Religion or belief: No impact

Race: No impact

Sexual orientation: No impact

Gender reassignment: No impact

Pregnancy and maternity: No impact

Marriage and civil partnership: No impact

Protected characteristics impact details: No impact. The Committee Report provides an update to Members but makes no financial or policy decisions.

Poverty and socio-economic

What impact is the proposal likely to have on the following?

Prospects and opportunities: No impact

Places: No impact

Financial: No impact

Poverty and socio-economic impact details: No impact. The Committee Report provides an update to Members but makes no financial or policy decisions.

Human rights

Which of the below human rights will be affected by this proposal? No human rights will be affected

What impact do you consider this proposal to have on the human rights of people? No impact

Human rights impact details: No impact. The Committee Report provides an update to Members but makes no financial or policy decisions.

Equalities, poverty and human rights screening assessment

What impact do you think there will be to equalities, poverty and human rights? No impact

Is a Full Impact Assessment required? No

Children's rights and wellbeing

What likely impact will the proposal have on children and young people? No impact. The Committee Report provides an update to Members but makes no financial or policy decisions.

Which of the below children's rights will be affected by the proposal? No children's rights will be affected

Explain how the children's rights selected above will be affected: No impact. The Committee Report provides an update to Members but makes no financial or policy decisions.

Children's rights and wellbeing screening assessment

What impact do you think there will be to children's rights and wellbeing? No impact

Is a Full Impact Assessment required? No

Data protection

Will your proposal involve processing personal data? No

Data protection screening assessment

What change will there be to the way personal data is processed? No personal data will be processed

Is a Full Impact Assessment required? No

Island and mainland rural communities

Does your proposal impact island and mainland rural communities? No

Island and mainland rural communities screening assessment

What impact do you think there will be to island and mainland rural communities? No difference

Is a Full Impact Assessment required? No

Climate change

Does the proposal involve activities that could impact on greenhouse gas emissions (CO₂e)? No

Does the proposal have the potential to affect the environment, wildlife or biodiversity? No

Does the proposal have the potential to influence resilience to extreme weather or changing climate? No

Provide information regarding your selection above: No impact. The Committee Report provides an update to Members but makes no financial or policy decisions.

Climate change screening assessment

Have you identified potential impact for any of the areas above or marked any as not known? No

Is a Full Impact Assessment required?No

HIGHLAND DELIVERY PROGRAMME: CONSULTATION COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED COUNCIL RESPONSE

Comment 1 - Hilton, Milton and Castle Heather Community Council

- *What do you think about the strategic priorities for infrastructure?*
Pleased to see that rail infrastructure is prioritised in this document. Also support the prioritising of active travel. It is difficult to comment because of this document being such a broad overview. We hope that the mentioned road infrastructure projects will also provide infrastructure for active travel and bus travel. Welcome the prioritising of landscape restoration projects and biodiversity.
- *What do you think about the requirements for the settlement(s) in your area?*
Plans to enhance the facilities of Hilton Community Centre are welcomed. Active travel infrastructure is much needed.

Recommended Council Response –

Welcome supportive comments. **NO CHANGE** required to HDP.

Comment 2 - Homes for Scotland

- *What do you think about the strategic priorities for infrastructure?*
Homes for Scotland (HFS) welcome the opportunity to comment on The Highland Council's (THC's) Highland Delivery Programme (HDP) and associated Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline (DHLP) for the Inner Moray Firth. Whilst Scottish Government (SG) guidance on housing land audits (HLAs) is expected this autumn, HFS welcome THC's pro-active approach to creating their first HDP in the absence of specific guidance. In creating the HDP, it is important to rely on the SG's Local development planning guidance, May 2023 (the Guidance), and the provisions of Regulation 24 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2023 (the Regulations) which states that: "delivery programme is to set out the following matters- (a) a list of actions required to deliver each of the policies and proposals contained in the local development plan and an explanation as to how those actions are to be taken, (b) the timescale for the conclusion of each such action, (c) the expected sequencing of, and timescales for, delivery of housing on sites allocated by the local development plan." THC's proposed tiered definitions of deliverability factors is welcomed. The following comments refer to the Guidance and the Regulations and are intended to be constructive in order to assist THC in creating a realistic and robust HDP where all stakeholders are clear how sites will be delivered. It is, however, recognised that this is a "point-in-time" document and that there are a range of policies and interventions that will influence the HDP in the coming years. Given this, it is suggested that the HDP is updated annually to account for changes to capital programmes, new development pressures etc., once the HLA is agreed. As you note, the HDP will sit alongside the HLA. The latter will forecast delivery whilst the HDP will set out what is required to make a site deliverable. This is covered in paragraph 228 of the Guidance, which states that: "The Delivery Programme is expected to demonstrate that land identified in the Proposed Plan is deliverable. It should set out a clear pathway to facilitate the delivery of homes, particularly where action is needed to overcome identified constraints."

It is suggested that for the HDP to meet the requirements of the Regulations that THC should detail specific actions that are required to deliver development sites, timescales for this and state who is responsible for addressing the action. For example, where the Council own a site, the action should include dates for the marketing and concluding missives along with detail of who will undertake this. These details are key to meeting criteria c) of Regulation 24. Paragraph 201 of the Guidance expands on Regulation 24 and states that: "An ambitious Delivery Programme has the potential to proactively guide and steer the delivery of the [Local Development Plan] LDP, setting out a clear route to delivery for every site and proposal within the plan." It goes on to summarise ideal features of a Delivery Programme. To provide more certainty it is suggested that rather than noting "assumed" contributions, the HDP includes more accurate costs for potential contribution rates per house as well as the likely split of costs between lead and supporting delivery partners as well as the timescales for delivery. This will ensure that, as paragraph 203 of the Guidance states, the Delivery Programme aligns: "...where possible, with wider local authority budgets and should consider not only the capital impacts of proposals, but also revenue costs to the authority and others. It should reflect any financial shortfalls and the proposals to address those; include any bridging or priming required and plan for their management; and monitor risk and implications if funding is not forthcoming as anticipated." Greater certainty on potential direct and indirect developer contributions will allow developers to factor this into their viability assessments and for THC to understand where timescales for delivery do not align. The latter is important to understand where one action is dependent on the delivery of another. Paragraph 224 of the Guidance states that medium- or long-term allocations within the pipeline should have a site brief or masterplan. The HDP identifies existing masterplans and, if possible, should include hyperlinks to these. Where relevant, THC should include details where design briefs or further masterplans may be prepared along with other potential interventions. The latter may include requirements for compulsory purchase, design frameworks, and design guides or codes. Given the anticipated housing pressures in the Inner Moray Firth area and range of smaller sites within settlements across the Highlands we suggest that sites with a capacity of 4-24 units are also included in the DHLP because it is important that they too are deliverable and contribute to housing supply. It is suggested that when reviewing allocations within the existing Highland Council local plans that where there is no planning consent, or live application, for a site, that THC write to the landowner/promotor to understand their intentions. Other councils have undertaken this as part of their evidence gathering. This approach is particularly important for legacy sites where THC should consider a "use it or lose it" approach and potentially de-allocate the site in the next LDP, if the landowner/promotor does not market the site. Writing to existing landowners/promotors will assist THC when considering such sites alongside submissions they may receive at the call for ideas stage, scheduled to take place from later this year. We trust that the above is a welcome and constructive review of the HDP.

- *What do you think about the requirements for the settlement(s) in your area?*
See above. No further specific comments.

Recommended Council Response –

- *Annual update of Delivery Programme* – Agreed. The Highland Delivery Programme will be updated at least on an annual basis if not more frequently. **NO CHANGE required to HDP.**
- *Detail Specific Delivery Actions* – The Council has produced a Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline document for all large sites in Highland which includes specific delivery actions to enable consented and allocated housing sites. The related 2024 Housing Land Audit now provides more detailed sequencing and timescale information for all allocated and consented sites including those between 4 and 24 units. **The changes requested are set out within the Deliverable Housing Land Pipeline and 2024 Housing Land Audit.**
- *Detailed Costs & Contribution Rates* - The Council accepts that exact costs, timescales and contribution rates would allow better financial planning for all parties, but capital programme decisions are often subject to change and some information is commercially confidential. The Council offers more detailed developer contributions advice on a case-by-case basis at both pre-application and application stage. **NO CHANGE required to HDP.**
- *Better Landowner Intention Intelligence* – The Council accepts that not all allocated sites are owned by a party willing to sell at a price that will make development profitable for a housebuilder. Our new Highland Local Development Plan (HLDP) Call for Development Sites process asks for better evidence of willingness to sell and the viability of development on each site. We will also check the availability and viability of existing plan allocations with each landowner in considering whether they should be reallocated in the new HLDP. **The changes requested will be addressed through the new HLDP process. NO CHANGE required to HDP.**

Comment 3 – Nairn West & Suburban Community Council

- *What do you think about the strategic priorities for infrastructure?*
NWSCC is generally supportive of the strategic infrastructure projects list in the delivery programme. By far the most significant strategic infrastructure issue for Nairn is of course the bypass, which is not under the control of Highland Council.
- *What do you think about the requirements for the settlement(s) in your area?*
Part 1 – Generally, it is noted that the Lochloy-Balmakeith bridge appears in two sections, and one should be removed. This project is highly contentious within the Lochloy area and NWSCC requests Highland Council to urgently find a suitable solution so that the Developer Contribution will not be lost.

Part 2 - With respect to the Community Facilities project (Leisure Centre fitness studio/changing village), NWSCC restates its disappointment that this is the only community project that has been identified for Nairn. This project was approved by a Developer Contributions Action Group consisting within its membership and benefitting High Life Highland as an income generator without any needs assessment or consultation with the community, whilst similar facilities exist elsewhere in the town and may be economically impacted by competition. We again request that the funding for this project be repurposed for a more valuable community facility project for Nairn.

NWSCC is encouraged that the process for submission and consideration of community facility developer contributions has been modified in the Feb 2023 Developer Contributions Protocol and revised DCAG terms of reference to enable greater community involvement in identifying community projects. NWSCC has been in correspondence with Ross Lindsay on how the new protocol will work in practice and Ross had kindly offered to make a presentation to CCs on the topic before he moved on to another role. We hope that Ross's replacement or the team will be able to organise a seminar so that the process is well understood, especially in view of Developer Contributions arising from the Delnies development.

Part 3 – We draw attention to the Nairn Local Place Plan, which is presently under review by Highland Council. When approved this plan will be a critical reference for Developer Contribution opportunities across all categories. NICE, which led creation of the LPP, will employ a Development Officer to implement plan projects and this Officer should be consulted when developer contributions are being considered. The 300-home development at Delnies is going ahead (against the LPP and community wishes) and if the LPP Development Officer role is not in place, it is important that NICE and Nairn's community councils are consulted on potential projects. NWSCC is aware of a number of current and potential projects at strategic locations that should be given the time to be worked up for submission, such as a) The Links - Links Development phase 2 and 3 to extend and improve the capacity and offering at the Links for residents and visitors alike. Several path improvements are needed at the Links to cope with increased footfall and to extend disabled access. The disabled ramp to the beach needs rebuilt. b) Water sports and Beach Facilities - New toilets/ changing rooms and showers / outdoor showers / changing places. Nairn Harbour needs integrated water sports facilities for locals and visitors. c) Nairn Museum - Large parts of Viewfield House cannot be used by the Museum because of damp caused by poor maintenance in the past and much of the Museum collection cannot be displayed because of lack of space. d) Community Centre: The Community Centre usage is steadily increasing and, as an example of a project which would increase capacity, new IT, computer, projection and display systems are required to enhance their offering.

Part 4 – With respect to the list of Transport projects, NWSCC is disappointed to see that these have been taken from the Active Travel Masterplan, which was a desktop exercise by an external consultant in 2020 and much of it has little or no community support. Very few public comments were received, and extensive contributions from community councils, including NWSCC, were ignored. We strongly submit that the following plans are not suitable to be undertaken until the bypass is completed: a) High Quality active travel route through Nairn, and b) Pedestrianisation of the Brae (results of HC consultation not published). The following are highly contentious, having had minimal or no consultation with locals or residents affected and should not be undertaken until proper assessments have taken place: a) Cycle street on Harbour St., b) Making Mill Road one way, c) Shutting off parts of Seabank Road and Seafield Street, d) Bus Gate on High Street preventing car access, and e) Private land at Nairn Golf Club being recommended for cycle and walking paths.

Recommended Council Response –

- *(Part 1) Duplication of Lochloy-Balmakeith Bridge action* – Agreed. The duplication is a factual error and should be corrected. **The requested factual correction has been made within the Delivery Programme.**
- *(Part 2) Community Facilities Project* – The Council is open to add to the HDP any additional community facility project if it has been progressed to feasibility stage; i.e., there is an indicative design, cost, timescale, evidence of community support, and at least the prospect of balance funding being identified for the project. However, to date, insufficient evidence has been received to justify an additional community facility project within the Nairn section of the HDP. **NO CHANGE required to HDP.**
- *(Part 3) Nairn Local Place Plan (NLPP)* - The Council is aware of the NLPP priorities and content and can reflect aspirational ideas within the new Highland Local Development Plan. We will also work with any local Development Officer to assess evidence of the feasibility of any community facility project. If sufficient evidence exists, then the HDP can be updated to include that project provided the project is directly connected to the impact of new development. We cannot seek and use developer contributions for facilities unconnected with the impact of new development. For example, it is far more legitimate to seek monies towards a new facility or the expansion of the capacity of a facility rather than simply for its refurbishment or qualitative improvement. **NO CHANGE required to HDP.**
- *(Part 4) Transport Concerns* - The Active Travel Masterplan underwent public consultation on 21st May 2021 when a total of 330 comments were received. This was adequate and justifies the schemes listed in the Delivery Programme. The feedback received through the consultation provided the evidence base for the strategy and related policies. The individual transport projects will be subject to further consultation and negotiation with affected parties. Transport projects rarely receive unanimous public support because they have direct but localised adverse effects on certain neighbours and owners but offer a wider but more diffuse public benefit. **NO CHANGE required to HDP.**

Comment 4 - NatureScot

- *What do you think about the strategic priorities for infrastructure?*
We have previously commented as part of the preparation of the various local development plans and do not have any further comments on the strategic priorities for infrastructure.
- *What do you think about the requirements for the settlement(s) in your area?*
We have previously commented on individual settlements as part of the preparation of the various local development plans and do not have any further comments to make on them. We would like to highlight, however, on page 76 for Golspie and page 82 for Thurso, reference to 'SNH' under the heading 'Lead and Supporting Delivery Partners', and we would like to see these changed to 'NatureScot'.

Recommended Council Response –

The requested name **change** is a factual update and has been made within the revised Delivery Programme

Appendix 3: DELIVERABLE HOUSING LAND PIPELINE FOR HIGHLAND

LDP Site or Application Reference in 2024	Site Name	Remaining Capacity 2024	Year 1 Programming 2024-25	Year 2 2025-26	Year 3 2026-27	Year 4 2027-28	Year 5 2028-29	Year 6 2029-30	Year 7 2030-31	Year 8 2031-32	Year 9 2032-33	Year 10 2033-34	Year 11 & Beyond	Pipeline Timeframe 1-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11+	DELIVERABILITY STATUS No constraints Constraint(s) [1 or more] Insurmountable Constraints [unlikely to be resolved within 10 years]	Likely / Known Constraints
Alness AL02	Crosshills	170	0	0	0	0	30	30	0	40	0	0	70	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Access, Marketability
Alness AL03	Milnafua Farm	65	8	9	0	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Alness AL04	Whitehills	50	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	None	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Affordable Housing Funding
Alness AL06	Obsdale Road	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	35	7-10	Constraint(s)	A9 Road Junction Capacity
Auldearn AU01	Land at Meadowfield	30	0	0	0	6	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Flood Risk
Avoch AV01	Rosehaugh East Drive	39	0	0	0	0	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	Medium	No Constraints	None known
Avoch AV02	Muiralehouse	80	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Possible Ownership
Beauly BE01	Old BE1 Beauly North	328	20	20	12	0	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Medium Term Marketability, Programming
Beauly BE04	West of Cnoc na Rath	90	0	0	0	0	20	20	10	0	0	0	40	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Ownership, Potentially Competing Uses
Conon Bridge CB02	Braes of Conon North	27	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	None known
Conon Bridge CB04	Braes of Conon (South)	160	0	0	28	33	30	30	20	19	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Conon Bridge CB05	Pescanova Factory Site	72	0	0	0	0	0	28	20	24	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Flooding, Contamination, Possible Ownership
Conon Bridge CB06	Riverford	75	0	10	24	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Programming
Cromarty CM01	Sandilands	33	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4-6	Constraint(s)	Built Heritage, Road Access, Possible Ownership
Croy CR01	West of Primary School	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints but Complete	None known
Croy CR02	North West of Primary School	50	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	School Capacity, Road Access
Dingwall DW01	Dingwall DW01	28	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	10	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Gradient, Road Access
Dingwall DW02 and DW03	Dingwall North	98	20	27	10	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Network Capacity Constraint
Dores DO02	Land South of Church	25	0	12	0	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Possible Ownership
Drumnadrochit DR02	Adjacent to Co-op	43	14	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	None known
Drumnadrochit DR03	Drum Farm	93	35	24	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	None known
Evanton EV01	Teandallon East	100	0	0	0	30	30	20	20	0	0	0	0	4-6	Constraint(s)	Road Access
Evanton EV02	Southeast of Evanton Bridge	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	0	7-10	Constraint(s)	Road Access
Fort George FG01	Fort George	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	30	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Existing Use
IMFLDP1 Evanton EV3	Culcairn	160	0	50	19	26	50	15	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Invergordon IG01	Cromlet	93	35	0	48	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Invergordon IG02	Invergordon Mains	400	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	50	0	300	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Affordable Housing Funding
Invergordon IG03	Land south west of Railway Station	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Other Competing Non-Housing Land Uses
Invergordon IG04	Disused fuel tank farm	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	0	0	7-10	Constraint(s)	Contamination, Viability
Inverness Central INC01	Diriebught Depot	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Existing Use, Contamination, Road Access, Flooding
Inverness Central INC02	Porterfield Prison	30	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Relocation of Existing Use, Built Heritage
Inverness Central INC04	North East of Academy St	80	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	58	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Other Competing Non-Housing Land Uses
Inverness Central INC05	Shore Street City Centre Expansion	200	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	20	20	0	100	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Competing Land Uses, Affordable Housing Funding, Road Capacity
Inverness Central INC10	Inverness Castle and Bridge Street	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	11+	Constraint(s)	Other Competing Non-Housing Land Uses
Inverness East INE01	Easterfield	74	0	28	0	8	30	8	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness East INE02	Ashton South	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	70	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Access & Capacity
Inverness East INE03	Ashton East	480	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	45	390	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Access & Capacity
Inverness East INE05	Stratton North	295	0	0	0	0	0	80	35	35	35	35	75	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	A96 Dualling CPO, East Link
Inverness East INE06	Stratton East	166	50	80	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known

Inverness East INE07	Milton of Culloden South	350	0	0	0	35	40	40	40	40	40	40	110	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	A96 Dualling CPO, East Link, Possible Ownership
Inverness East INE11	Castlehill	125	0	0	0	0	0	40	40	40	5	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Access & Capacity
Inverness East INE13	Ashton West	685	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	685	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Ownership, Road Access
Inverness East INE15	Ashton Central	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	40	140	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Access & Capacity
Inverness East INE16	Stratton West	60	0	0	0	0	0	40	20	0	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Potentially Competing Uses
Inverness East INE17	Stratton Central	65	0	0	0	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	4-6	No Constraints	None known
Inverness East INE18	Balloch Farm	298	49	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS01	Drakies House	26	21	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS02	Inshes Small Holdings	101	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	30	21	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Ownership
Inverness South INS03	Druid Temple	155	15	35	45	45	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS07	Earls Gate	115	10	12	28	43	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS08	Drummond Hill	32	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS09	Ness-side Central	455	70	70	70	70	70	70	35	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS11	Ness Castle West	245	11	5	0	40	40	40	40	40	29	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Woodland, Access, Drainage
Inverness South INS12	Ness Castle East	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	40	20	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Programming
Inverness South INS13	Ness-side South	200	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	20	20	20	80	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Possible Ownership
Inverness South INS14	Wester Inshes	100	0	0	22	27	25	25	25	25	16	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness South INS16	Ness-side North	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Ownership
Inverness South INS17	Knocknagael	100	0	0	0	0	0	30	10	30	30	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Farm Tenancy
Inverness West INW01	East of Stornoway Drive	350	0	0	15	70	30	30	30	30	30	30	85	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Gradient, Drainage, School Capacity
Inverness West INW02	South of Golfview Road	87	26	27	26	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness West INW05	Westercraigs North	54	33	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	None known
Inverness West INW08	Torvean North	118	0	48	40	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Inverness West INW10	East of Muirtown Locks	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Existing Uses, Ownership, Road Access
Kiltarlity KT01	Glebe Farm Phase 2	40	0	0	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Programming
Kirkhill KH01	East of Birchbrae Drive	25	0	0	0	6	4	5	5	5	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Overhead Powerlines, Marketability
Kirkhill KH02	Achnagairn	25	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	4-6	Constraint(s)	Sewerage Capacity, Possible Ownership
Muir Of Ord MO01	Lochan Corr	104	0	0	74	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road and Active Travel Access
Muir Of Ord MO02	Land South of The Cairns	60	0	0	0	15	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Legal Agreement Requirements, Infrastructure
Munlochy ML01	Hillpark Brae	32	0	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Nairn NA01	Achareidh	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Possible Ownership, Woodland, Built Heritage
Nairn NA04	Sandown	Not Stated	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	50	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Ownership, Community Opposition
Nairn NA05	East of Retail Park	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	11+	Constraint(s)	Competing Land Uses
North Kessock NK01	Bellfield Farm	80	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Possible Ownership
Seaboard Villages SB01	Land East of Primary School	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	22	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability
Tain TN03	Land to Rear of Craighill Primary School	40	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	New School Opening, Demolition, Road Access (Density)
Tain TN04	Tain Royal Academy	100	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	50	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	New School Opening, Demolition, Road Access
Tain TN05	East of Burgage Drive	40	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Possible Ownership, Competing Uses
Tain TN06	Knockbreck Road	210	0	0	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	50	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Road Access
Tomatin TM02	North West of Railway Viaduct	36	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	6	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Drainage, Peatland, No Public Sewerage
Tornagrain TG01	Tornagrain	3521	45	63	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	425	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Programming
Windfall 21/05918/FUL	Schoolhouse Belt	28	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3	No Constraints	Planning constraints overcome, Road Construction Consent
Windfall 22/01126/PIP	Meiklefield Road	117	0	0	28	30	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Windfall 22/03219/PIP	Inverness MoL South	400	0	50	80	80	80	80	30	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Electricity Network and School Capacity
Windfall 23/05237/MSC	Delnies	300	0	75	75	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Windfall 23/05466/FUL	Rosskeen	80	0	0	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Woodland, Road Access
Broadford BF02	South of Cabereidh	46	0	0	0	21	0	16	5	4	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Affordable Housing Funding
Broadford BF03	Glen Road (West)	Not Stated	24	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Short	No Constraints	None known

Fort William FW01	Annat Farm	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Ownership, Access, Gradient, Woodland
Fort William FW05	Lundavra Road	125	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	105	4-6	Constraint(s)	Family Ownership
Fort William FW06	Lochside Common Grazings	Not Stated	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	4-6	Constraint(s)	Deep Peat, Road Access
Fort William FW07	Upper Achintore (South)	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Undeliverable	Insurmountable Constraints	Access
Fort William FW08	Blar Mor	122	0	61	0	0	0	0	30	31	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	Planning constraints overcome
Fort William FW09	Carr's Corner	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Undeliverable	Insurmountable Constraints	Non-Housing Uses More Marketable
Fort William FW10	Belford Hospital & Former RC Primary School	95	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	70	4-6	Constraint(s)	Awaiting New Hospital Completion & Transfer
Fort William FW11	BT Depot Police Station	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Undeliverable	Insurmountable Constraints	Part developed for Hotel. BT Existing Use.
Fort William FW13	Upper Achintore (North)	297	72	0	0	0	0	42	40	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Affordable Housing Funding
Kilbeg ES04	Kilbeg Village	91	14	0	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Affordable Housing Funding
Kinlochleven KN03	Smelter	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Undeliverable	Insurmountable Constraints	Marketability, Viability, Competing Uses
Kyle of Lochalsh KL01	Kyle North	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Undeliverable	Insurmountable Constraints	Ownership, Road Access, Deep Peat, Gradient
Lochcarron LC06	Kirkton Expansion Area	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	11+	Constraint(s)	Other Competing Non-Housing Land Uses
Mallaig MA02	North and West of Reservoir	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Marketability, Gradient
Portree PT02	North of Storr Road	66	0	0	14	16	12	18	6	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Prior Completion of Link Road
Portree PT03	Kiltaraglen (South)	30	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	10	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Prior Completion of Link Road
Portree PT04	Kiltaraglen (North)	248	0	0	0	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	143	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Affordable Housing Funding
Portree PT06	South of Achachork	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	11+	Insurmountable Constraints	Ground Conditions, Road Access
Portree PT11	Community Centre and Adjoining Ground	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Undeliverable	Insurmountable Constraints	Other Competing Non-Housing Land Uses
Spean Bridge SB07	North of Bridge Cafe	25	0	0	0	10	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	4-6 onwards	Constraint(s)	Flooding
Strontian SR01	Drimnatorran	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	7-10	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Affordable Housing Funding
Uig UG01	North Cuil	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	11+	Constraint(s)	Ownership, Agricultural Tenancy, Marketability, Affordable Housing Funding
Ullapool UP01	Fields Adjacent to Golf Course North	30	0	0	0	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	4-6	Constraint(s)	Possible Ownership
Auchtertyre Growing Settlement	Land Adjoining Primary School	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	11+	Constraint(s)	Trunk Road Access, Marketability, Affordable Housing Funding
Castletown CT02	Castlehill Steading and adjoining land	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	11+	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Flood Risk
Castletown CT07	North of Mackay Street	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	11+	Constraint(s)	Marketability
Edderton ET02	West of Station Road	37	0	5	2	0	0	5	5	0	0	5	15	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Affordable Housing Funding, Road Access, Cultural Heritage
Edderton ET01	North-East of Haven	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	11+	Constraint(s)	Layout, Previous Uses Nearby, Woodland, Cultural Heritage
Halkirk HK02	West of Bridge Street	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	11+	Constraint(s)	Multi Ownership, Flood Risk, Layout, Current and Previous Uses
Thurso TS01	East of Juniper Drive	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	11+	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Flood Risk, Railway Line
Thurso TS05	Thurso Mart Site	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	11+	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Previous Use
Golspie GP02	Sibell Road	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	11+	Constraint(s)	Flood Risk, Access, Railway, Woodland
Golspie GP03	Drummuie	30	0	2	1	1	0	34	2	2	2	2	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Flood Risk, Watercourses
Dornoch DN04	Dornoch North	89	11	30	30	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Flood Risk, Watercourses, Access, Landform
Dornoch DN01	Meadows Park Road	30	12	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1-3 onwards	No Constraints	None known
Lairg LA01	South-West of Main Street	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	11+	Constraint(s)	Flood Risk, Watercourse, Access
Bonar Bridge BB01	Cherry Grove	30	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	23	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Watercourses
Brora BR03	East Brora Muir	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	11+	Constraint(s)	Access, Potentially Competing Uses
Wick WK06	East of Murray Avenue	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	11+	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Neighbouring Use
Wick WK04	North Of Coghill Street	44	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Cultural and Built Heritage
Wick WK02	South of Kennedy Terrace	44	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	42	1-3 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability
Wick WK12	Lower Pulteneytown	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	11+	Constraint(s)	Conservation, Built Heritage, Existing Uses, Multi Ownership
Wick WK01	Hill of Man BMX Track	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	40	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Flood Risk, Previous Use
Thurso TS04	Thurso West	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	180	7-10 onwards	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Flood Risk, Watercourses
Thurso TS07	Land at Sir Archibald Road	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	11+	Constraint(s)	Marketability, Multi Ownership, Flood Risk, Existing Users, Previous Uses

Appendix 4:

MASTERPLAN CONSENT AREAS (MCA): SUGGESTED GOVERNANCE AND PROCESS

