

Submission number

S-140-1

Consultee number

1405738

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

After the last drop in session at Ardersier Hall it was brought to my attention that Station Road maybe considered for access to the proposed MCA site if houses are built on it. I would like to bring to your attention, with attached evidence, how this would be detrimental and dangerous to the existing residents and safe travel to school for a large proportion of the primary school pupils. The first 2 photos show how existing residents have to park on Station Road due to lack of parking for their properties. This makes it difficult to navigate this part of the road safely. As you can see there is an obscured view due to the camber of the road, and you have to pull out to pass the parked cars often to be met with a car coming towards you because of the obscured view. I am aware that it has a 20mph speed limit but very few people adhere to this. The 3rd photo show how an access road in through the stonemasons yard would be unsuitable due to there being a total of 4 different access points for vehicles on the opposite side. If the MCA does go ahead, which I hope it won't in it's current proposal of 600 houses, the stonemasons yard would be an ideal active travel route to encourage people to walk, cycle etc to access the existing village. All things in the village are accessible on foot. Across from the stonemasons yard is a well used bus stop, encouraging active travel through the yard to this would be a positive.

Encouraging people to drive home and then access all areas of the village on foot would only be a success if the yard was used as the main active travel route to the village and having no vehicular access through there at all. [second email] In 2018 planning permission was refused for 16 2 bed bungalows in the stonemasons yard on Station Road. The planning application was 18/02994/ful. Can you explain what has now changed, especially the drainage part, to make an MCA proposal relevant when all the refusal points are still relevant today as nothing in that area has changed at all. Look forward to your full explanations for each point of refusal.

Submission number

S-139-1

Consultee number

1405740

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

I would like to register my objection to the planned development of 600 new properties in Ardersier. I feel that the development will add considerable pressure to existing facilities and infrastructure, without adding any noticeable improvements to the area. It does not address the real housing need in the Highlands, which is for genuinely affordable options for the existing local population. More or less doubling the size of the village without addressing the ongoing needs for infrastructure to support the residents, both old and new, is a huge mistake.

Submission number

S-138-1

Consultee number

1405743

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

I don't want the house build in Ardersier. I moved to the village because it was small and quiet. I don't believe any of the promises made to support the village with a larger population or that there will be enough spaces for the children going to culloden high school considering they already have to use portacabins. What about the problems with beds in Raigmore hospital and struggling to get a GP appointment. And if the highland government wants to provide more housing why is it not council houses or supported housing that is being built. No one can afford to buy a house these days. Why not use some of the land to build a government funded carehome. That will provide local jobs and help Raigmore with their bed shortage. 600 houses would more than double to population of the village. That is a crazy amount of change.

Submission number

S-137-1

Consultee number

1405744

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

I am writing as a resident of the Ardersier Conservation Area to formally object to the proposed Masterplan Consent Area (MCA) at Ardersier Mains for 600 houses. I share the community's broader concerns regarding the doubling of our village population and the immense pressure

on our overstretched GP, school facilities and road network, which will have been highlighted by other objectors. In addition to these concerns, I wish to highlight a specific and dangerous threat to our heritage. My home, like many in the historic heart of Ardersier, is a traditional property built in an era before modern foundations were standard. Living within the Conservation Area, I have a duty to preserve this building's character; however, this proposal places its very structural integrity at risk: •

Vibration Damage to Historic Structures: The narrow, historic roads and pavements in my part of Ardersier were never designed for the volume of heavy plant machinery and HGVs required for a 600-house excavation, or indeed the volume of traffic which would accompany such a massive increase in the size of the village. We are already experiencing alarming tremors when heavy vehicles pass; the constant, intensified shaking" from years of construction traffic and increased local traffic flows threatens to cause irreversible cracking and subsidence in houses that lack modern foundations. • Preservation vs.

Suburbanisation: The Highland Council's own policies state that development within a Conservation Area should "preserve or enhance" its character. This massive threatens to cause irreversible cracking and subsidence in houses that lack modern foundations. •

Preservation vs. Suburbanisation: The Highland Council's own policies state that development within a Conservation Area should "preserve or enhance" its character. This massive suburban-style expansion does the exact opposite. It erodes the distinct setting of our historic village and replaces a sensitive rural border with high-density housing. •

Highway Safety in the Historic Core: The increased traffic through our narrow conservation streets poses a direct safety risk to residents. Our roads cannot be widened without destroying the very historic buildings the Council is supposed to protect. This proposal prioritises developer profit over the physical safety of our historic homes and our sense of community. I urge the Council to reject this MCA and protect the structural and cultural heritage of Ardersier. In addition to these concerns I would like to air my concerns about the MCA process. It seems to me that attempts to accelerate the planning process such as this undermine the democratic accountability that should sit at the heart of local decisions. Lack of accountability leads to lack of "ownership" of decisions within the community and this in turn undermines community cohesion and support for our local institutions. Turn out for local elections is woefully low as it is and accelerating huge decisions such as this only serves to further undermine and alienate peoples confidence in our local democracy. The Highlands and in particular Ardersier has a brilliant sense of community- it's what sets us apart from most other parts of the world; it is why we and our many visitors hold us in their hearts. This process is undermining our community our ownership of decisions which fundamentally affect our world. I object to this and anyone with a interest in community building & accountability would object to these MCA proposals and the process which is being inflicted on our precious community. "

Submission number

S-136-1

Consultee number

1405708

Date

01/04/2026

### Comments

Planning Objection – Proposed Housing Development at Ardersier I wish to formally object to the proposed housing development at Ardersier on the grounds that it conflicts with key policies within the development plan and raises significant concerns regarding infrastructure capacity, road safety, environmental protection, and the scale of development relative to the existing settlement.

1. Scale of Development and Impact on Settlement Character The proposal for approximately 600 homes represents development on a scale that would effectively double the size of the existing village. Such expansion risks overwhelming the existing settlement and is inconsistent with the principles of sustainable and proportionate growth. This raises concerns in relation to Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 28 (Sustainable Design), which requires developments to be designed in a way that reflects the character and capacity of the surrounding area and existing settlement pattern. In addition, the proposal appears inconsistent with NPF4 Policy 15 – Local Living and 20-Minute Neighbourhoods, which seeks to ensure that development creates connected, integrated communities rather than isolated extensions lacking appropriate services and infrastructure.

2. Road Safety and Transport Infrastructure The existing road network serving Ardersier is already under pressure and is not suitable for the level of additional traffic that would result from a development of this scale. The proposed primary access point is located on a section of road which includes a blind crest and an already poorly sighted junction. Introducing a major residential access at this location raises significant road safety concerns. This conflicts with Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 56 (Travel), which requires developments to demonstrate that they can be safely accessed and that they will not adversely affect road safety or the capacity of the transport network. In addition, the surrounding road network includes several single-track roads with blind corners and limited passing places, many of which are already in poor condition. Regardless of assurances provided within planning documents, a development of 600 homes will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle movements on these roads. Under National Planning Framework 4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First, development should only proceed where infrastructure capacity has been fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are identified and delivered.

Should any development proceed, more than one access point should be provided to avoid creating a bottleneck on an already busy road.

3. Education Infrastructure Both Ardersier Primary School and Culloden Academy are understood to already be operating under pressure and require modernisation. A development of this size will inevitably generate a significant number of additional pupils. This raises concerns in relation to National Planning Framework 4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First, which requires essential infrastructure such as schools to be planned and delivered in tandem with development. There appears to be insufficient clarity regarding how local education capacity will accommodate the population growth associated with this proposal.

4. Environmental and Ecological Impact There are known badger setts along the south-east edge of the proposed development area. It is unclear what ecological surveys have been undertaken or what mitigation measures are proposed. This raises concerns under Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 57 (Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage), which requires that development avoids significant harm to protected species and habitats. A full ecological assessment and clear mitigation strategy should be provided before any development

could reasonably be considered. 5.

Integration with the Existing Village If development were to proceed, it should be properly integrated with the existing village rather than functioning as a disconnected extension. The design should provide clear connections to the existing settlement and avoid creating a segregated residential area. This requirement aligns with Policy 28 (Sustainable Design) and the placemaking principles embedded within the development plan. 6. Existing Derelict Structure The derelict and dilapidated croft located on the southern edge of the site should be addressed as part of any redevelopment proposals. The building has already been subject to vandalism and anti-social behaviour, and incorporating this land into the development would represent a more coherent and responsible approach to site planning.

7. Construction Traffic and Road Impact The construction of approximately 600 homes will require a substantial volume of heavy construction vehicles over an extended period. The surrounding road network includes narrow rural roads and single-track sections with limited passing places which are not designed to accommodate sustained heavy goods vehicle traffic. This raises concerns regarding road safety, deterioration of road surfaces, and disruption to residents. A development of this scale should only be considered where a comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided demonstrating how construction traffic will be safely managed and how damage to local roads will be prevented or repaired. 8. Drainage and Surface Water Management A development of approximately 600 homes will significantly increase impermeable surfaces such as roofs, roads and driveways. This will inevitably increase surface water runoff and place additional pressure on local drainage infrastructure. It is unclear what assessment has been made regarding the capacity of existing drainage systems and sewer networks serving Ardersier. A comprehensive drainage strategy, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), should be demonstrated to ensure that the development will not increase flood risk either within the site or in surrounding areas. 9. Pressure on Health and Community Services A development of this scale would introduce a substantial increase in population to the area. It is unclear what assessment has been made regarding the capacity of local health services, including GP and dental provision, which already serve a growing population across the wider area. In accordance with the Infrastructure First principle within National Planning Framework 4, essential community infrastructure should be planned and delivered alongside new development to ensure that existing services are not placed under unsustainable pressure. 10. Cumulative Development Between Inverness and Nairn The wider area between Inverness and Nairn has already experienced significant recent and ongoing housing development. While there is a recognised need for additional housing across parts of the Highlands, the scale and concentration of development within this particular corridor raises concerns regarding cumulative impact. Developments at Delnies, Croy, Tornagrain, Balloch, Stratton, Culloden West and previous developments in Ardersier itself have all been completed or are underway in a 10 mile radius of the proposed MCA site. There is no need to add 600 houses to this specific location. This area has been well developed. The block to funding for Ardersier Port could be argued that it does alleviate the apparent need" for these homes. Could there be a better location? North of the Kessock bridge for example or in Lochaber or Badenoch? Ardersier does not need 600 additional homes. A continued concentration of large housing developments within this area risks placing disproportionate pressure on local infrastructure or in Lochaber or Badenoch?

Ardersier does not need 600 additional homes. A continued concentration of large housing

developments within this area risks placing disproportionate pressure on local infrastructure services and transport networks while other parts of the Highlands may be more appropriate locations for sustainable growth. The cumulative impact of development within the Inverness–Nairn corridor should therefore be carefully considered before additional large-scale housing proposals are approved. I feel the MCA is being looked at in a vacuum. Have Highland Council taken a step back to consider all the developments on the Nairn - Inverness corridor? As someone working in the business community this makes commuting and working in the area very difficult. It also has overwhelmed Culloden Academy and the other local services in the area. This MCA is not in a vacuum its part of our wider community across this wider location. And a more traditional planning route would allow the progress to be considered along the way based on actual demand actual environmental and social considerations during the build not a blanket approval of years of development. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above the proposal raises significant concerns in relation to road safety infrastructure capacity school provision environmental protection drainage cumulative development pressure and the overall scale of development relative to the existing settlement. In its current form the proposal appears inconsistent with key policies within the development plan and should therefore be refused or significantly reconsidered. "

Submission number

S-135-1

Consultee number

1405711

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

Planning Objection – Proposed Housing Development at Ardersier I wish to formally object to the proposed housing development at Ardersier on the grounds that it conflicts with key policies within the development plan and raises significant concerns regarding infrastructure capacity, road safety, environmental protection, and the scale of development relative to the existing settlement. 1. Scale of Development and Impact on Settlement Character The proposal for approximately 600 homes represents development on a scale that would effectively double the size of the existing village. Such expansion risks overwhelming the existing settlement and is inconsistent with the principles of sustainable and proportionate growth. This raises concerns in relation to Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 28 (Sustainable Design), which requires developments to be designed in a way that reflects the character and capacity of the surrounding area and existing settlement pattern. In addition, the proposal appears inconsistent with NPF4 Policy 15 – Local Living and 20-Minute Neighbourhoods, which seeks to ensure that development creates connected, integrated communities rather than isolated extensions lacking appropriate services and infrastructure. 2. Road Safety and Transport Infrastructure The existing road network serving Ardersier is already under pressure and is not suitable for the level of additional traffic that would result from a development of this scale. The proposed primary access point is located on a section of road which includes a blind crest and an already poorly sighted junction. Introducing a major residential access at this location raises significant road safety concerns. This conflicts with Highland-wide Local Development

Plan Policy 56 (Travel), which requires developments to demonstrate that they can be safely accessed and that they will not adversely affect road safety or the capacity of the transport network. In addition, the surrounding road network includes several single-track roads with blind corners and limited passing places, many of which are already in poor condition. Regardless of assurances provided within planning documents, a development of 600 homes will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle movements on these roads. Under National Planning Framework 4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First, development should only proceed where infrastructure capacity has been fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are identified and delivered.

Should any development proceed, more than one access point should be provided to avoid creating a bottleneck on an already busy road.

3. Education Infrastructure Both Ardersier Primary School and Culloden Academy are understood to already be operating under pressure and require modernisation. A development of this size will inevitably generate a significant number of additional pupils. This raises concerns in relation to National Planning Framework 4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First, which requires essential infrastructure such as schools to be planned and delivered in tandem with development. There appears to be insufficient clarity regarding how local education capacity will accommodate the population growth associated with this proposal.

4. Environmental and Ecological Impact There are known badger setts along the south-east edge of the proposed development area. It is unclear what ecological surveys have been undertaken or what mitigation measures are proposed. This raises concerns under Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 57 (Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage), which requires that development avoids significant harm to protected species and habitats. A full ecological assessment and clear mitigation strategy should be provided before any development could reasonably be considered.

5. Integration with the Existing Village If development were to proceed, it should be properly integrated with the existing village rather than functioning as a disconnected extension. The design should provide clear connections to the existing settlement and avoid creating a segregated residential area. This requirement aligns with Policy 28 (Sustainable Design) and the placemaking principles embedded within the development plan.

6. Existing Derelict Structure The derelict and dilapidated croft located on the southern edge of the site should be addressed as part of any redevelopment proposals. The building has already been subject to vandalism and anti-social behaviour, and incorporating this land into the development would represent a more coherent and responsible approach to site planning.

7. Construction Traffic and Road Impact The construction of approximately 600 homes will require a substantial volume of heavy construction vehicles over an extended period. The surrounding road network includes narrow rural roads and single-track sections with limited passing places which are not designed to accommodate sustained heavy goods vehicle traffic. This raises concerns regarding road safety, deterioration of road surfaces, and disruption to residents. A development of this scale should only be considered where a comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided demonstrating how construction traffic will be safely managed and how damage to local roads will be prevented or repaired.

8. Drainage and Surface Water Management A development of approximately 600 homes will significantly increase impermeable surfaces such as roofs, roads and driveways. This will inevitably increase surface water runoff and place additional pressure on local drainage infrastructure. It is unclear what assessment has been made regarding the capacity of existing drainage systems and sewer networks serving Ardersier. A comprehensive drainage strategy, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), should be demonstrated to ensure that the development will not increase flood risk either within the site or in surrounding areas.

9. Pressure on Health and Community

Services A development of this scale would introduce a substantial increase in population to the area. It is unclear what assessment has been made regarding the capacity of local health services, including GP and dental provision, which already serve a growing population across the wider area. In accordance with the Infrastructure First principle within National Planning Framework 4, essential community infrastructure should be planned and delivered alongside new development to ensure that existing services are not placed under unsustainable pressure.

10. Cumulative Development Between Inverness and Nairn The wider area between Inverness and Nairn has already experienced significant recent and ongoing housing development. While there is a recognised need for additional housing across parts of the Highlands, the scale and concentration of development within this particular corridor raises concerns regarding cumulative impact. A continued concentration of large housing developments within this area risks placing disproportionate pressure on local infrastructure, services, and transport networks, while other parts of the Highlands may be more appropriate locations for sustainable growth. The cumulative impact of development within the Inverness–Nairn corridor should therefore be carefully considered before additional large-scale housing proposals are approved. Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the proposal raises significant concerns in relation to road safety, infrastructure capacity, school provision, environmental protection, drainage, cumulative development pressure, and the overall scale of development relative to the existing settlement. In its current form, the proposal appears inconsistent with key policies within the development plan and should therefore be refused or significantly reconsidered.

Submission number

S-134-1

Consultee number

1405712

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

I am writing to register a strong objection to the proposed Masterplan Consent Area for up to 600 new homes in Ardersier. This proposal is deeply concerning - not simply because of its scale, but because of the very real and immediate strain it will place on infrastructure that is already under pressure. The local GP surgery is already stretched. Residents routinely struggle to secure timely appointments, and there is no clear or credible plan explaining how such a significant increase in population would be supported. The same applies to local schooling. Capacity is already an issue for families, and it is difficult to see how this could be safely or realistically expanded to meet the demands of hundreds of additional homes. The road network is another serious concern. The routes in and out of Ardersier are already busy, constrained, and at times unsafe. Increasing traffic on these roads will inevitably worsen congestion, increase risk, and have a direct impact on residents' day-to-day lives. There is no evidence of infrastructure improvements that match the scale of what is being proposed. I am also deeply sceptical of the assurances being made by the developer. From personal experience

with Springfield Homes' previous development in the village, promises made at the planning stage were not delivered in reality. Residents were shown plans for a children's play park, yet what was ultimately provided was little more than a grassy patch with a couple of benches and a few wooden stumps. This does not inspire confidence that the facilities and community benefits being presented as part of this proposal will be meaningfully delivered. Beyond infrastructure concerns, the sheer scale of this development is entirely out of proportion with the village itself. Ardersier is a small and established community, and a development of this magnitude would fundamentally and permanently alter its character. Finally, I have serious concerns about the use of a Masterplan Consent Area in this case. This approach risks reducing scrutiny and limiting opportunities for meaningful public input. A development of this size requires careful, transparent oversight - not a streamlined process that removes accountability. I want to be clear that I am not opposed to development in principle. However, development must be appropriate, genuinely sustainable, and supported by infrastructure that is in place before people move in - not promised after the fact. At present, this proposal fails to meet those basic expectations. I urge the Council to reconsider both the scale of this development and the use of an MCA in Ardersier.

Submission number

S-133-1

Consultee number

1405713

Date

01/04/2026

Comments

My wife and I live in one of the Springfield properties that were built in 2019 - 2024. We have little faith in Springfield. The development has still not been fully finished - drainage work has still to be partially re-done and previous drainage snagging spoil removed from the development. The planting of bushes, etc that were shown on the development plan around the site, was only partially completed - we have almost nothing near us. Completion of buildings and fit out was rushed and huge snagging problems ensued. The site manager was very nice and helpful but was overworked and not able to check that works in properties were completed. Parts of our property were not lagged with the required glasswool" so water pipes froze and a major snagging had to be done. Some internal walls in our property are not insulated. I found 4 large unopened rolls of "glasswool" in our loft - the loft had been properly insulated. Simple things like silicon sealing of shower tray joints were poorly done and subsequent water leaking were left to us to rectify! We have to pay a large factoring fee for the upkeep of the development but the schedule of annual work has never been fully honoured. The quality of work of the factors' contractors is to a minimum standard. The village of Ardersier does not have adequate infrastructure now. Another 600 properties will totally overwhelm what we have. Springfield do not have a good track record for providing infrastructure improvements. One glaring example is their development beside Drumossie Brae. Springfield were required to improve the B9177/Culloden Road junction. This is a busy road and difficult to negotiate. The

junction should have been traffic lighted integrated with the traffic lights at the Caulfield Road/Culloden Road junction. Now Springfield are building more houses on Drumossie Brae the B9177/Culloden Road junction will become much worse. Highland Council must extract better infrastructure improvements from developers and fully enforce those improvements. "

Submission number

S-132-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

31/03/2026

Comments

The transport survey does not take into account the extra traffic onto the A96 and the wider network of surrounding roads the estimated number of vehicles is definitely under estimated, the map attached is totally wrong, a Springfield representative at the information day had never seen it and had no clue who had produced it, I definitely think that the information is wrong to the point of it actually being deceptive, Secondly the local development plan was a process that looked at growth on the village and the boundaries were agreed by the council, why then is it then acceptable to extend that boundary and call it MCA and lastly the visual impact assessment does not take into account the view from a distance on the B9039 when planning was applied for by various houses in Ardersier they had to be lower and moved back as not to be seen from that direction above the existing houses and on top of the hill to the left of the proposed site, why now in such a big development which will make a significant eyesore above the village if this allowed,

Submission number

S-131-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

31/03/2026

Comments

I am totally against the proposal to build 600 house in the historic conservation village of Ardersier. There is no infrastructure to support the development. Before a single brick is put down we need to have purpose built GP surgeries, dentists, schools & a fit for purpose upgraded hospital. These houses that are proposed are not for local people & many will end up as 2nd homes & airb&b's with them being advertised in places for eg London. There are already many new developments in a 10 mile radius of Ardersier including Tonagrain & Delnies. Many of the historic houses of Ardersier do not have foundations & the building works could cause

detrimental damage to them. The B roads are not suitable for the extra traffic that is proposed during building & afterwards. There are many parts of the roads that really can't carry big vehicles. Where is all the wildlife going to go? For example badgers, hares any many more. The development will be blot on the landscape & Ardersier will no longer be a village but a suburb of Inverness. If Havantus want houses for their workers let them be built on their brown field site & not destroy the small historic village of Ardersier

Submission number

S-130-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

31/03/2026

Comments

As a current resident of Ardersier I have some reservations over the new development. My main concerns are the roads in and around the village not being of standard to take the extra traffic. The airport road and the road to Gollanfield are not great at the best of times. The buses and large vehicles using the road currently struggle with width. The surface water is also a frequent issue. Other issues I feel should be considered are that the local school will no longer be fit for purpose with more children living in the new development, the village shop is too small and a bigger community would need a more suitable store. Also a medical / dental facility would be a huge plus for a community that heavily relies on public transport at times and has a very mixed age group. I think that Springfield made a nice development in the last five years with several housing options. It would be good to see affordable housing for those who are young and live in the village already and want to stay and also those who like my self would like to sell a flatted property and buy a 2 - 3 bedroom house but also stay in the village. I think there are lots of plus points to a new development but care has to be taken so as not to ruin the look and feel of a small historical village and preserve its appeal to people. I hope the developers will seriously take this onboard.

Submission number

S-129-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

31/03/2026

## Comments

[redacted – personal details]. We have concerns about the proposed Springfield Development Plan to build 600 houses in the land around our street and surrounding areas bordering our village. We believe this is too big a project and our village does not have the infrastructure to support it with regards roads, nursery and school provision..nursery, primrsry and secondary schools which are services thst are lready stretched and there is no gusrantee that Highland Council would have the means, or the will to do anything about that given that they have not akready done so, despite the need for a new secondary school at Culloden. Ardersier is also not well served by Stagecoach bus services and disadvantaged in being able to get services to attend healthcare apointment and workplaces. We have grave concerns over the proposed plan which says Fulmar Crescent may be cut off from the rest of the village by having access to Station Road cut off. I was of the understanding that an established public right of way could not be closed off, esp one that has been established for generations, but if it is then we would object to that right being taken away. We believe this would constutute a risk to the health and wellbeing of residents of the street, several of whom are elderly and have serious illneses and disabilities. It would not be appropriate fit me to invade their privacy by lidting them here, but there are mmore than 4. [rephrased – personal details] Family health issues mean that closing off Fulmar Crescent to the main roads could potentially impede access of emergency services if required for a family member. We also believe it would have a detrimental impact on the value of our property.

[rephrased – personal details] Family circumstances mean that any impact on the property may create legal issues.

Submission number

S-128-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

30/03/2026

## Comments

My final comment on this issue just now, is that the outline map contained within the Transport Statement dated 12th February 2026 by ECS Transport Planning Ltd is significantly different to that shown on the Display Board in the Memorial Hall, Ardersier, during the open meeting of the 11th March 2026. If the outline map from the 11th March event is correct, then the accuracy of the Transport Statement is now questionable.

Submission number

S-127-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

30/03/2026

Comments

Planning Objection – Proposed Housing Development at Ardersier I wish to formally object to the proposed housing development at Ardersier on the grounds that it conflicts with key policies within the development plan and raises significant concerns regarding infrastructure capacity, road safety, environmental protection, and the scale of development relative to the existing settlement.

1. Scale of Development and Impact on Settlement Character The proposal for approximately 600 homes represents development on a scale that would effectively double the size of the existing village. Such expansion risks overwhelming the existing settlement and is inconsistent with the principles of sustainable and proportionate growth. This raises concerns in relation to Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 28 (Sustainable Design), which requires developments to be designed in a way that reflects the character and capacity of the surrounding area and existing settlement pattern. In addition, the proposal appears inconsistent with NPF4 Policy 15 – Local Living and 20-Minute Neighbourhoods, which seeks to ensure that development creates connected, integrated communities rather than isolated extensions lacking appropriate services and infrastructure.

2. Road Safety and Transport Infrastructure The existing road network serving Ardersier is already under pressure and is not suitable for the level of additional traffic that would result from a development of this scale. The proposed primary access point is located on a section of road which includes a blind crest and an already poorly sighted junction. Introducing a major residential access at this location raises significant road safety concerns. This conflicts with Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 56 (Travel), which requires developments to demonstrate that they can be safely accessed and that they will not adversely affect road safety or the capacity of the transport network. In addition, the surrounding road network includes several single-track roads with blind corners and limited passing places, many of which are already in poor condition. Regardless of assurances provided within planning documents, a development of 600 homes will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle movements on these roads. Under National Planning Framework 4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First, development should only proceed where infrastructure capacity has been fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are identified and delivered.

Should any development proceed, more than one access point should be provided to avoid creating a bottleneck on an already busy road.

3. Education Infrastructure Both Ardersier Primary School and Culloden Academy are understood to already be operating under pressure and require modernisation. A development of this size will inevitably generate a significant number of additional pupils. This raises concerns in relation to National Planning Framework 4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First, which requires essential infrastructure such as schools to be planned and delivered in tandem with development. There appears to be insufficient clarity regarding how local education capacity will accommodate the population growth associated with this proposal.

4. Environmental and Ecological Impact There are known badger setts along the south-east edge of the proposed development area. It is unclear what ecological surveys have been undertaken or what mitigation measures are proposed. This raises concerns

under Highland-wide Local Development Plan Policy 57 (Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage), which requires that development avoids significant harm to protected species and habitats. A full ecological assessment and clear mitigation strategy should be provided before any development could reasonably be considered.

5. Integration with the Existing Village If development were to proceed, it should be properly integrated with the existing village rather than functioning as a disconnected extension. The design should provide clear connections to the existing settlement and avoid creating a segregated residential area. This requirement aligns with Policy 28 (Sustainable Design) and the placemaking principles embedded within the development plan.

6. Existing Derelict Structure The derelict and dilapidated croft located on the southern edge of the site should be addressed as part of any redevelopment proposals. The building has already been subject to vandalism and anti-social behaviour, and incorporating this land into the development would represent a more coherent and responsible approach to site planning.

7. Construction Traffic and Road Impact The construction of approximately 600 homes will require a substantial volume of heavy construction vehicles over an extended period. The surrounding road network includes narrow rural roads and single-track sections with limited passing places which are not designed to accommodate sustained heavy goods vehicle traffic. This raises concerns regarding road safety, deterioration of road surfaces, and disruption to residents. A development of this scale should only be considered where a comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided demonstrating how construction traffic will be safely managed and how damage to local roads will be prevented or repaired.

8. Drainage and Surface Water Management A development of approximately 600 homes will significantly increase impermeable surfaces such as roofs, roads and driveways. This will inevitably increase surface water runoff and place additional pressure on local drainage infrastructure. It is unclear what assessment has been made regarding the capacity of existing drainage systems and sewer networks serving Ardersier. A comprehensive drainage strategy, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), should be demonstrated to ensure that the development will not increase flood risk either within the site or in surrounding areas.

9. Pressure on Health and Community Services A development of this scale would introduce a substantial increase in population to the area. It is unclear what assessment has been made regarding the capacity of local health services, including GP and dental provision, which already serve a growing population across the wider area. In accordance with the Infrastructure First principle within National Planning Framework 4, essential community infrastructure should be planned and delivered alongside new development to ensure that existing services are not placed under unsustainable pressure.

10. Cumulative Development Between Inverness and Nairn The wider area between Inverness and Nairn has already experienced significant recent and ongoing housing development. While there is a recognised need for additional housing across parts of the Highlands, the scale and concentration of development within this particular corridor raises concerns regarding cumulative impact. A continued concentration of large housing developments within this area risks placing disproportionate pressure on local infrastructure, services, and transport networks, while other parts of the Highlands may be more appropriate locations for sustainable growth. The cumulative impact of development within the Inverness–Nairn corridor should therefore be carefully considered before additional large-scale housing proposals are approved.

Conclusion For the reasons outlined above, the proposal raises significant concerns in relation to road safety, infrastructure capacity, school provision, environmental protection, drainage, cumulative development pressure, and the overall scale of development relative to the existing settlement. In its current form, the proposal appears inconsistent with key policies within the

development plan and should therefore be refused or significantly reconsidered. Supporting documents

N/A

Submission number  
S-125-1

Consultee number  
1405492

Date  
30/03/2026

#### Comments

I'm writing you this email in response to the proposed plan to build 600 new home in Ardersier. I am a owner of a Springfield home in Ardersier and as much as they are good homes the area which we live in ie doctors,schools and other local authorities cant coup at the moment The reason we moved to Ardersier in the first place was to get away from the busy life in Inverness and to enjoy the quiet life in a village and the building of 600 new homes will destroy the peace. You can imagine all 600 homes having 1 or 2 cars or even more maybe and the road system is bad enough as it is. I think you need to look into improving the roads and the local authorities first before allowing the building of more homes.

Submission number  
S-124-1

Consultee number  
1405491

Date  
30/03/2026

#### Comments

Dear Highland Planning Department, I would like you to not my strong objec'on to the scale of Springfields proposed development at Ardersier, per the MCA proposal. In no way can the village cope with being turned into a town in the 'mescale of building these 600 proper'es.

Slower development as shown at Campbeltown and Connage is acceptable and put much less stress on the infrastructure of the village. Roads are appalling in the village, please just take a drive up Nairn and Sta'on Road to see for yourself. Please reconsider and take the 'me to do what is best for this charming seaside village that I grew up in.

Submission number

S-123-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

29/03/2026

Comments

Further to my previous concerns regarding increased traffic on the current road network surrounding Ardersier, I would like to point out that I am NOT a member of Innes Smith's minority, nor am I concerned about the view from my house, despite Innes Smith's recent claims in the local press. What I am is a resident of Ardersier who lived through Springfield's development of MacPhersons Way and the often chaotic Traffic Management Plan, if such a thing actually existed, during the construction period when lorries and plant were regularly backed up on Nairn Road and access to side roads often blocked by construction traffic awaiting access to the building site. All this on a road that was supposed to include a safe access to school route for local families! As building preparation work has already commenced on this site, including site investigations, archaeological evaluations and, hopefully, a Radon Gas survey, I think it safe to assume that this project will be going ahead in the near future, as Springfield would not be going to this significant expense if they were not confident of being given the go-ahead anyway, but I would hope and pray that a safe, effective and MONITORED Traffic Management Plan would be in place prior to the commencement of any construction work.

Submission number

S-122-1

Consultee number

N/A

Organisation

Petty and Ardersier Community Heritage

Date

27/03/2026

Comments

Ardersier village has voiced strong opposition to a new proposed MCA scheme to build additional housing in the fields above the village, doubling the size of the village, with no plans

to improve roads, secondary schools or healthcare. Please consider the views of the electorate. The published Nairnshire local place plan and last year's Highland Council Development Plan both spent money scoping out housing need for the next decade and set development areas which never included new housing in Ardersier. The growth of Port of Ardersier was included in these plans which indicated no need for additional housing at Ardersier village. The reasons for opposing the development have been many including issues around watercourses, environment, radon and proximity to SSSI, Scheduled monuments and a conservation area. The MCA proposal is not within the areas set for development but is on farmland. The village is already surrounded by unfinished house build projects, at Nairn, Tornagrain, and Culloden and by new developments at Ardersier and at Croy. These bring new housing to market regularly so there are already enough new developments locally. There is also recent local experience of developers not delivering on promises of infrastructure, landscaping and a pedestrian crossing. Unfortunately the developers schemes only include a small percentage of the affordable housing required to solve the current Highland housing issue. There are also thousands of empty and second homes in the area. The answer to housing could be more creative than building more. The speculative nature of the future of the Port of Ardersier should not be an excuse for developer greed, which is how it appears at present. Highland Council should be following their own Development Plans and not grab easy opportunities to destroy farmland for housing. Already the Port, unsuccessful as it is, has planning applications to industrialise more of the countryside habitats around the existing site. The planning submitted omitted the nearest scheduled monument and conservation area, but not those further away, and less likely to be affected. We wonder why. Development around Ardersier has been ongoing over the last decade. We do not want more natural habitats lost to industry, housing, or golf courses, as these have already recently been lost around Ardersier. Future need for housing never included the Ardersier MCA land and local views are that development should be halted until the infrastructure exists to cope with the doubling of traffic and population and until the housing need is reassessed in years to come. The area is served by single track, narrow and pavement-less roads and the A96 already over capacity and no sign of being duelled any time soon. Bus timetabling and lack of parking at the airport rail station mean that car use is high, and roads are busy. For now, enough is enough until current developments are finished, the future of the Port is less speculative and roads can be made safer.

Submission number

S-121-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

27/03/2026

Comments

As residents who live just outside the proposed boundary of this development and have owned our property for over 16 years, we were both very disappointed not to have been notified in advance by mailing; only learning of it via word of mouth after the first consultation had already

taken place in January. This is poor communication to assume that everyone uses social media and also displays a lack of concern regarding the potential impact that such a development will have on residents in the immediate surrounding area. We wish to point out that we received advanced notice via mailing of planning meetings well in advance of the proposed Ardersier Port redevelopment held last year. Since moving to our property, we have noticed a steady increase in traffic using the unclassified single track roads which serve our property in the hamlet of Baddock. These roads are in a poor state of repair and only fit for limited local and farm vehicle access. The single track road running past the entrance to our property which connects Baddock crossroads to Ardersier Mains Farm road (past Ardersier Cemetery), has soft verges; 1 side of which conceals a deep ditch (on the Cemetery side) and no footpaths. There have been multiple accidents over the years when unsuspecting vehicles misjudged the road width and tipped into the ditch blocking the road sometimes for several hours until recovery was able to take place.

Another very important point is the presence of a natural spring originating from the upper part of the field just below the cemetery, which frequently discharges water across the road due to ongoing lack of ditch clearing. In wet weather this stretch of road becomes muddy and slippery, but during the cooler months the same patch often freezes, creating treacherous conditions for any road user particularly at night with no street lighting. The same field frequently floods onto the road at the bottom entrance into surrounding fields during periods of heavy rain with deep surface water ensuing. The road runs in a straight line with no traffic calming measures, thus creating an increased hazard from speeding traffic travelling down the hill. It has become more perilous to walk along these single track roads because many vehicles do not slow down to pass pedestrians - an accident waiting to happen. Lack of adequate passing places has also resulted in vehicles encroaching onto the top of our drive to let oncoming vehicles pass, so having a detrimental effect on the road surface which has developed a large pothole as a consequence. The road is also actively used by horse riders exercising their animals to and from the surrounding croftlands where they are kept. Following our attendance at the drop-in meeting at Ardersier Memorial Hall on 11th March we wish to raise the following concerns and objections: 1 – Referring to the large not to scale coloured photographic poster of the development displaying planned phases, we are extremely concerned about a proposed second entrance from Ardersier Mains Farm road into the 2nd housing phase. We are vehemently opposed to any access to this top road. In addition to points noted in opening remarks, our main objection arises from the further threat of the road from Baddock crossroads to Ardersier Mains Farm road becoming a 'rat run' as a short cut to avoid traffic congestion on the wider roads. This is completely unacceptable. There was a suggestion made at the meeting that the farm road could be closed off after this proposed junction, but that will cut off Cemetery access without a long detour and inconvenience residents from outlying properties to access the village. Neither options are practical. We are also opposed to the idea of being made to navigate our way through a large residential estate to reach the village. 2 – On reading the various public consultation boards outlining concerns raised from the previous meeting in January, we are in agreement with many other village residents that the scale of the development risks the village completely losing its character and a large proportion of prime agricultural land will be lost. Worryingly, the environmental impact of increased noise and pollution arising from such an increase in traffic volume along such narrow unsuitable roads poses a safety risk. 3 - There is no infrastructure in place to accommodate resultant swelling of population eg: no post office, banking and increased pressure on schools and doctors surgery etc. Already we have sporadic bouts of low water pressure to our property. The already recently upgraded sewer system will likely require further major upgrading to cope with

capacity. 4 - It is also unclear just how many people are likely to be employed at the new Port of Ardersier, who may need accommodation in the village when there is a 300 home development currently being built at Delnies and another 400 home development has just been rubber stamped east of Inverness. We note the larger Tornagrain 'New Town' project has hit the buffers, as from media reports the developer moved on in 2022 apparently because of a shortage of tradespeople and slow progress regarding the upgrading of the A96. 5 - Recent reports suggest around 1500 jobs could have been created at the Port, numbers now uncertain with the Westminster government rejecting the last proposed tenants. The number of 11,000 appears to refer to the whole Freeport area. Local demand for housing suggests a greater need for smaller homes in the 'affordable' bracket. Preliminary indications suggest a maximum of 25% of the development would include this housing type. It begs the question regarding affordability to the local population if the other 75% will be larger 'Executive' properties and out of reach for many. One has to question to whom the developer is actually pitching their marketing. Closing remarks: Whilst we are in agreement that there is a need for more housing to accommodate an ever increasing population UK wide, we have reached the conclusion that the sheer scale of this development is completely inappropriate for the village and therefore we fully object to it. Until the A96 is dualled between Inverness and Auldearn, with completion of the proposed Nairn Bypass and the B9092 is widened with major infrastructure upgrades to relieve traffic congestion, this cannot be allowed to proceed. Instead, emphasis should be made on completing the Tornagrain New Town with better infrastructure and access to both the A96 and Ardersier Port.

Submission number

S-120-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

27/03/2026

Comments

Following on from my previous comment I do not think the housing is needed in this area since the 1.5bn investment in the port has now fallen through. I would highly recommend sorting out the current infrastructure issues you have with and Tornagrain before before creating more of the same issues in other rural villages and towns.

Submission number

S-119-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

25/03/2026

## Comments

This planning application is in croft land, no provision for any improvement by the NHS to provide health care for the influx of people,

Submission number

S-118-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

25/03/2026

## Comments

I am writing to express concern about the proposed MCA and the impact it may have on our small village. The current plans risk placing significant strain on our local community and way of life. Our village depends on a balance between nature, local livelihoods, and sustainable activity. Restrictions associated with the MCA could limit traditional practices and reduce opportunities for residents who rely on access to the surrounding land and waters. Decisions made without fully considering local voices may unintentionally harm the very communities that have long cared for this environment. As a local resident I oppose this development.

Submission number

S-117-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

25/03/2026

## Comments

Far too large a development that will ruin a lovely coastal village. Need infrastructure in place before this goes ahead. This should include road upgrades, school, medical, retail etc. Springfield failed badly on last development in village and HC have not pursued them to ensure pavements were completed or safe crossing for schoolchildren. No, no, no to this utterly abhorrent plan.

Submission number

S-116-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

25/03/2026

Comments

With the Chinese contract not going ahead this application should be stopped until there is confirmed investment, if not the Houses will be sold before any workers are employed that may eventually need them

Submission number

S-115-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

25/03/2026

Comments

I am largely in favour of this scheme as the village requires it to keep our doctor's surgery open, to reduce the decline in the used capacity of the primary school, and to increase opportunities for young people living here. I do however have reservations about the impact on our road infrastructure as there is currently no plan or intention to improve/upgrade the existing road infrastructure. The impact of an additional 600-1200 cars on the existing roads will lead to an accelerated decline in the condition of this infrastructure so I would like to see a written legal and costed commitment to upgrade this infrastructure with a further costed commitment, in writing to contribute towards future maintenance for this infrastructure.

Submission number

S-114-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

23/03/2026

Comments

I don't think this plan is good for the area Ardersier is a small rural village that does not have the resources to support 600 extra houses It will spoil the peaceful nature of the village

Submission number

S-113-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

23/03/2026

Comments

With regards to the proposed MCA in Ardersier, I was born in the village in 1976 and have lived most of my life here after returning to the village in my mid twenties to bring up my family, I have seen the village undergo changes with the introduction of new houses in Connage and Fettes road areas which blend into the village and do not detract from the village" feel. The sheer volume of this proposed housing scheme will I believe envelope the village and will adversely affect the feel of Ardersier from being an actual traditional Scottish village to just another "new housing scheme" area. Currently the primary school is not suitable for the proposed number of houses and the potential influx of children the doctors surgery is already understaffed with many appointments having to be made at Nairn. With regards the actual requirements there are already a large number of houses being constructed in the immediate area Delnies ( Nairn ) & Tornagrain that again will have an impact on the services available for people in the area. The mention that houses will be required for future opportunities at the Port of Ardersier are really only hearsay and the reality will be that people working at this site will mainly be on short term contracts and will either already be in the area or will be part of a travelling worker contingent that is always prevalent in these types of works. I believe the developer is not taking cognisance of the village heritage and surrounding area requirements by proposing a disproportionate amount of housing for the profit of their company and using flimsy arguments that there is a requirement for this.

Submission number

S-112-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

22/03/2026

Comments

There is just not the infrastructure for these houses. The roads are terrible. The school and gp is at capacity. There are so many issues in this village that should be prioritised before creating more. 600 homes is completely excessive and poorly planned. The construction traffic will cause chaos. Connecting roads to the A96 just aren't suitable for the kind of traffic these houses will create. There are many houses in the previous Springfield development for sale because of poor quality cons

Submission number

S-111-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

22/03/2026

Comments

Far too many houses. Changing from a village to a small town with no infrastructure. Springfield failed to provide this on their last development in the village and appear to have got away with it (no safe crossings/pavements provided).

Submission number

S-110-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

20/03/2026

Comments

This is much too large and will overwhelm an historic village. Chances are that with the failure of Port of Ardersier to expand, the project in Ardersier will stall and just a few houses be built. If it was made compulsory for all infrastructure to be build first, there could be some sense. The idea of a blanket permission to build seems undemocratic and smacks of the dreaded "brown envelope" culture. The fear is that when the project fails Ardersier will become a sink for all the undesirables in Inverness and will once again struggle. 600 houses is a lot of people even over several years and the GP surgery is already under pressure. Raigmore is sinking under too many people too. "

Submission number

S-106-1

Consultee number

1404635

Organisation

Nairn District Salmon Fishery Board Date

19/03/2026

Comments

On behalf of the Nairn District Salmon Fishery Board, a statutory consultee in the planning process, I wish to comment on the proposed Ardersier Masterplan Consent Area. Deep concerns have been raised amongst our members about the proposed development of 600 houses and associated infrastructure at Ardersier. While recognising the need for local affordable housing, the DSFB has very deep and specific concerns about the impacts of water supply for such a housing development. Already the River Nairn's ecology is being severely impacted by over-abstraction and rising water temperatures due to climate change (this can be lethal to salmon, trout and invertebrates in the river amongst other widespread environmental impacts). The Atlantic Salmon is now an IUCN listed endangered species. The DSFB would like to flag up this concern at this early stage and request that a full impact assessment is made when considering any water supply for these developments. It must not impact the River Nairn and its wildlife any further and the DSFB will be following developments very closely. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further explanation on how the already serious situation for the River Nairn might be made much worse should the water supply for this housing development be taken from the headwaters of the River Nairn.

Submission number

S-105-1

Consultee number

1404629

Date

19/03/2026

Comments

I note the site's proximity to European Site interests (Moray Firth SAC and SPA). While the proposed MCA site lies slightly inland, I would ask whether it poses any risks to these European Sites, perhaps related to drainage. The Council will be aware of regulation 9 of the MCA Regulations, whereby no MCA scheme grants authorisation for development which is likely to have an adverse effect on an onshore or offshore European Site. I envisage that the Council will, at the appropriate stage in the MCA process, consult NatureScot and interested eNGOs about this.

Submission number

S-104-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

16/03/2026

Comments

Having been at the 2nd information event I remain concerned about road infrastructure in particular. I live on the coast road B9039 and am understandably very interested in the planned access to the village. The road is, despite the newish 50mph and 30mph zones, extremely fast and has seen fatal collisions in the recent past. There is no footpath from the village to the Airport or beyond. The staff were able to show plans for site access but were extremely vague about how construction traffic and then residents would get to and from the site to the Inverness bound A96. At one point a Springfield rep said with a straight face that if it came to it they'd look at duelling the B9039!!! I find it deeply concerning that no thought appears to have gone into this, or if it has, no-one was able to speak to it. I'd also note that the idea of health is much wider than health service infrastructure, crucial as that is. The health of a community (measured by things like crime rates, prescription rates, drug use and violence) is likely to be significantly impacted by a doubling of its population without extremely careful thought, hard work and investment. I'm interested in how this is being considered and factored in.

Submission number

S-103-1

Consultee number

1403767

Date

12/03/2026

Comments

Kite Flying! When the Port goes belly up the whole idea will fail. Too large for a small village

- what about GP services / Raigmore.

Submission number

S-102-1

Consultee number

1403766

Date

12/03/2026

Comments

Wrong model. Wrong place. No confidence in developer. No one wants this!!! Your current houses are not selling. No need for more houses. School over capacity, roads not capable of more traffic. It says this is still only a possibility" well that's good to hear. I hope that ALL the views and emails sent to the Highland Council are taken into proper and FULL CONSIDERATION. Do not need any more houses in Ardersier. Over 4000 empty houses in the Highlands. You need to consider other sites that are actual brownfield sites. Ardersier is a nice village this plan is too large too close to the village and not suitable for the area."

Submission number

S-101-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

12/03/2026

Comments

Ardersier MCA Proposed 600 homes. I wish to raise concerns to the proposed development on the grounds of ground stability, hydrological impact, highway safety, and the potential risk posed to neighbouring historic properties. As a nearby homeowner of a historic property which has no formal foundations, I am deeply concerned about the potential structural risks this development may present. Historic properties of this nature are particularly vulnerable to ground movement and changes in soil stability. The proximity of the proposed landscaped areas to the banking above our homes raises serious concerns about whether adequate geotechnical assessments have been undertaken to fully understand the potential impact of excavation, landscaping, and construction activities on the stability of this bank. The bank above our properties currently supports a number of mature trees, some of which appear to be very old and will therefore have extensive and

far-reaching root systems. Any disturbance to these trees, their root structures, or the soil that supports them could destabilise the banking and increase the risk of soil movement or slippage. Such disturbance may also lead to the loss of natural reinforcement provided by established root systems that currently help maintain the integrity of the slope. In addition, there are natural springs present within this banking. These springs are part of the existing natural drainage pattern of the area. Construction works, excavation, or alterations to ground levels could disrupt or redirect these natural water flows. This could have unintended consequences for groundwater movement, potentially leading to water accumulation, erosion, or increased ground instability that could directly affect the historic properties situated below the bank. Given the known presence of natural springs and the sensitivity of the slope, it is essential that detailed hydrological and geotechnical assessments are undertaken and fully scrutinised before any development is approved.

Without such assurances, there is a significant risk that the long-term stability of neighbouring properties could be compromised. My second major concern relates to highway safety and the proposed vehicular access to the development. With approximately 600 homes proposed, the

volume of additional traffic generated by this development will be substantial. It is reasonable to assume that many households will operate at least two vehicles, meaning the local road network may have to accommodate well over a thousand additional vehicles associated with this development. The proposed access point is located on a fast section of the B9092 where the road camber is uneven and visibility is already restricted due to the road sitting lower than the surrounding landscape. This creates a potentially hazardous situation for vehicles entering or exiting the development. Even with traffic-calming measures proposed, the current junction arrangement does not appear sufficient for a development of this scale. A roundabout at the development entrance would represent a far safer and more appropriate solution. Roundabouts naturally slow approaching traffic and improve safety by regulating vehicle flow and removing the need for drivers to make high-speed turning decisions. Ardersier already has a 20 mph speed limit in place, yet this is frequently disregarded by drivers. A roundabout would provide a physical traffic management feature that encourages drivers to reduce speed in practice rather than relying solely on signage. Given the scale of the proposed development, the sensitivity of the land above existing historic homes, and the safety concerns relating to road access, I respectfully request that these issues are given very careful consideration. In particular, the risks associated with ground stability, natural drainage systems, and highway safety should be thoroughly addressed before any planning approval is granted. A scaled back development of approximately 100 homes would be preferable to retain existing properties integrity and equilibrium in Ardersier village as 600 homes would be far too many.

Submission number

S-100-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

11/03/2026

Comments

Why are we needing this in Ardersier when the new village at Tornagrain and the new houses on the edge of Nairn were supposed to support the housing needs in the area? We have also been promised improved infrastructure for the village when each time new houses get built in the village which amounts to an extra overpriced bus service that gets cancelled because of lack of use. As someone who grew up and lived in the village since the 80s I have witnessed bad quality housing being built with the promise of jobs that never come. This proposal is no different. Especially as there are already as I mentioned in Nairn and Tornagrain.

Submission number

S-98-1

Consultee number

N/A

Organisation

Caley Timber & Building Supplies Ltd Date

06/03/2026

Comments

Is this going to be another large developments that doesn't benefit local businesses? So often all the materials are shipped in from other areas of Britain, sometimes very far away. Local businesses like ours, that employ locals, don't see any benefit despite being 5 mins away. Surely there should be some percentage to say that large developers should buy locally.

Submission number

S-97-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

05/03/2026

Comments

I support this application. This will help the highland council build part of the 24,000 homes plus that are needed just now.

Submission number

S-95-1

Consultee number

1402407

Date

04/03/2026

Comments

Roads cannot cope with the builders traffic and a thousand extra cars on completion. I am also concerned about water supplies and sewage. About 100 new homes would be more acceptable. I will object to the 600 houses proposal.

Submission number

S-94-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

04/03/2026

Comments

I object to the proposed development. The transport facilities in the Highlands are ill-equipped to deal with a significant rise in the local population, particularly near Nairn. The A96 as the trunk road between Inverness and Aberdeen is already under considerable strain, with steadily increasing traffic volumes causing gridlock in Nairn in particular.

Without substantial investment and improvement in road networks, such a development must surely be ill-advised. Ardersier itself has little local amenities in existence to support a considerable increase in population. Provision of medical and dental care to the existing population is also already strained.

Submission number

S-93-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

04/03/2026

Comments

Whilst I welcome new housing in the area, the transport infrastructure nearby is completely inadequate. Traffic from the port and the new housing being build just outside Nairn will in itself create an enormous problem in the near future given the infrastructure as it stands.

600 houses will only add to this issue. Goes without saying that we desperately need the Nairn bypass to be completed as soon as possible to help ease the problem

Submission number

S-92-1

Consultee number

1402375

Date

04/03/2026

## Comments

I have only recently moved too the area within the last year It's fab place too live. But with those 600 extra house could double the size of the village And the infrastructure would struggle. Like the doctor surgery the shops might not be able too cope with 1000 new people. Appointment Is at docs be terrible with more people The roads in and out would suffer etc

Submission number

S-91-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

04/03/2026

## Comments

My concern with this development is the increase in traffic on the A96 and through nairn plus surrounding roads. As a resident of the cawdor area, I commute daily from cawdor east to auldearn and the A96 towards Forres. Traffic congestion through nairn has now reached a horrendous level. The addition of the (unnecessary) 20mph speed limit through nairn, plus enduring roadworks through nairn, has resulted in a massive increase in traffic passing along the rural cawdor road network to auldearn. Many commuters/HGVs therefore now choose to avoid nairn and pass by via cawdor. As such, rural traffic levels are approaching dangerous levels. Significant increases in the numbers of houses around croy/balloch/ardesier etc will only add to this situation. If the council are adamant that these developments must go ahead, please accelerate the dualling of the A96 and nairn bypass. These upgrades should be completed alongside any further housing developments. Progress of road improvements has not matched the increase in housing/traffic. The solution is NOT to lower all rural speed limits, but to look at the factors that has pushed much more traffic to rural roads and address these.

Submission number

S-90-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

04/03/2026

## Comments

The proposal to build 600 houses in Ardesier is utter madness. It will over whelm the existing village .Cause huge problems of increased traffic around the area which is already seeing congestion .The houses like many in the area will be bought by people mainly from the south who are buying houses in Nairn, Croy and Culloden and have the money to outbid locals . It is

completely unacceptable that good agricultural land is being used for housing .I totally disagree with this proposal . Knowing Highland council they will, however press ahead ignoring any objections .

Submission number

S-89-1

Consultee number

1402376

Date

04/03/2026

Comments

When will someone realise what the Highlands needs is the infrastructure to support all these new homes - what on earth are planners thinking about? To take just one example, Raigmore and general health facilities may have been adequate 20 years or so ago but I believe the population has almost doubled since then. Schools, dentists. Etc are all full to bursting, it's high time there was some joined up thinking going on in the Highlands and no more housing should be considered till infrastructure is improved. I don't live near Ardersier but every time I see another building site my heat sinks, the strain on the poor staff at Raigmore and the stress of people unable to get medical attention is VERY real.

Submission number

S-88-1

Consultee number

1402377

Date

04/03/2026

Comments

I am writing to express my support for the proposed development of up to 600 homes in Ardersier. There is no getting away from the fact that we are in the middle of a serious housing shortage across the Highlands. Young families are struggling to find somewhere affordable to live. Key workers are being priced out of the communities they serve. Private rents continue to rise, and property values in many areas now sit well beyond what the average wage can realistically support. In that context, the proposal to expand housing provision in Ardersier is welcome. Its proximity to Inverness makes it an obvious and sensible location for growth. Many people already commute into the city for work, and with the right infrastructure in place, this development could provide much needed homes within reach of employment, schools, and services. However, I would strongly urge that the majority of these homes be designated as

social housing or below market value rental properties rather than being released primarily for sale at current Highland market prices. If they are built mainly for private sale at prevailing values, they will simply remain out of reach for the very people who most need them. That would be a missed opportunity. This development has the potential to strengthen the local community, support working households, and relieve pressure across the wider region. To achieve that, affordability must be at its heart. Prioritising social and genuinely affordable rental housing would ensure that this project responds directly to the real and urgent need on the ground. Thank you for considering these comments.

Submission number

S-87-1

Consultee number

1402116

Date

03/03/2026

Comments

The issues, food security, healthcare and education, local infrastructure. Food security. • By building on farmland it will never be able to produce food again. • Along with the significant number of large developments in the Moray Firth area a significant amount of farmland has or will be removed from food production. • It has been proven that food logistics is the first to suffer in a crisis, Brexit, Covid, Ukraine, and now we have the risks imposed by the Iran war. • The Housing crisis message has been hijacked and exaggerated by business and political concerns wishing to promote their own agenda, along with a suggested hidden agenda of the SNP government to build a 7 million Scottish population to support their independence goals. • Are you, the decision makers willing to risk turning a (exaggerated) housing crisis into a food crisis. Food riots are much more damaging than housing concerns.

• It is much more important to address the immigration pressures. Healthcare and Education • 600 houses mean 1800 people, this scale of development has overtaken forward planning on school building, doctors surgeries, hospitals and dentistry. The development should not be allowed unless the developer puts in place measures to address this, including financing any additional building and staffing required, and including this within the development boundaries. Local Infrastructure • As above 600 houses means 1800 people, 1200 cars, and an immense amount of foul waste. There has been no progress on the A 96 except building roundabouts (A trunk road should be about getting from a to b quickly and safely) • Are we honestly willing to pump even more foul waste into the marine environment?

Submission number

S-86-1

Consultee number

1398693

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

Protected and historic sites adjacent to the MCA site 1. Ardersier SSSI 2. The development lies between two medieval scheduled monuments and is on former Knights Templar land. Developing the farmland around these sites will increase footfall along the 'Sandy Brae' and up Cromal Hill – both of which are scheduled. 3. The boundary wall and markers from 1750 lie across the top of the MCA site. These are not currently on the Highland HER but I have made efforts to get them recorded there and with HES (Historic Environment Scotland). No reply so far. I have photos and maps as evidence. 4. There is evidence of pre-history activity in the area and I ask that an archaeological survey is carried out as the fields in question have never been surveyed. A medieval Norse mount was found here by metal detecting. The 18th century part of Ardersier village is a conservation area, for which the planning laws require a much higher degree of scrutiny. The residents in the old village square put considerable effort into keeping it tidy and pleasant looking with planters etc. Ideally any development should not overlook or be visible from the Conservation area.

Submission number

S-85-1

Consultee number

1401295

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

Opposition to the MCA Ardersier for the following reason The possibility of land slippage affecting the bank which is a major feature of the village. Apart from natural causes,for example weather/earthquakes,the main reason for land slippage is human activity,that is CONSTRUCTION-the building of houses,roads and pipelines which often remove support thus causing instability. In addition CONSTRUCTION can also interrupt natural water paths,springs that are known to be in the area proposed for housing,which increases pore water pressure that can lead to land slippage. Also vibrations caused by heavy construction vehicles near slopes can also trigger failure. Infrastructure, the three main roads in/out of the village are in poor condition with one having a weight restriction placed on the bridge. Nairn road is still waiting for the promised pedestrian crossing so that children have a save access to Ardersier Primary School. Finally the fact that the proposed housing is be built on prime agricultural land just defies belief There is no justification for building on prime agricultural land when there is brown land that could be used.

Submission number

S-84-1

Consultee number  
1401296

Date  
16/02/2026

#### Comments

I would like to object to the proposal to build 600 new homes next to my house. I have grown up on the croft house that my father was born in in 1949 and we love the fact that we are in a rural countryside location, this proposal will spoil our idealic location and saddens my family at the thought of thousands off people who have got no connection to the area coming to live on our doorstep. The environmental impact will be massive and it is going to be detrimental to all the wildlife that I always see in the surrounding fields including badgers, rabbits, hares and pheasants, it is very sad to think the beautiful fields that surround us will become a concrete jungle of ugly poorly constructed houses, tarred roads and 1000's of cars. The proposed developers have a terrible history and the entire project will be an eyesore on the landscape and we will no longer feel safe in our house or be able to leave the door unlocked as with thousands of people coming from god knows where there will come an inevitable increase in crime.

Submission number  
S-83-1

Consultee number  
1401297

Date  
16/02/2026

#### Comments

I would like to register my objection to the potential building of private homes on the edge of Ardersier. This is based on the following reasons. 1. Environmental- the land ear marked, is an area that has underground springs, builing on this simply increases the potential for flooding. This is for the new houses and for the established village. Water must go somewhere and this concreting of natural water areas substantiallt creates flood risk, making this build plan unenvironmentally friendly and unsustainable in the long term. 2.

Springfield developments have prosecution for dumping asbestos and oils around scottish sites previousley. Their track record shows that care and concern for the environment is non-existent and any assurance from them is not worth the paper it is written on. 3.

Development of housing at Nairn and Tornagrain has permission and are yet to be built. Building homes in Ardersier as an exception while there is already substantial homebuild happening in the area, does not make sense. If the idea is for the Green Port, it has yet to show that the job volume will be anywhere the level required. Overall this suggests opportunism and not a realistic economic proposition to create appropriate inclusive communities. 4. This doubling of the village, changes it to a town, or in reality an urbanised suburb with increased population removal of open space and the toll on local roads, services and the infrastructure. There are additional concerns and I restate I strongly object to this gerrymandering of Approved Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Submission number

S-82-1

Consultee number

1401298

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I wish to put in writing my objections to the proposed 600 homes by Springfield. At present there are approximately 531 homes in our village of Ardersier, and the proposed 600 houses more than double which will have a detrimental effect. Firstly our current roads to, from and in the village are in need of repair and the road infrastructure is not capable of the increase volume of traffic, including construction vehicles and an extra estimated 700 cars. There would be a negative impact with the coming and going of construction vehicles during the building. Realistically how long is the proposed building site going to take till completion.? What percentage of these 600 homes to be private buyers, council or dare I even ask HMOs? The money that will be given to the Highland Council from Springfield estimated in the region of £6000,000 - 1. How much of this money will be re-invested in our community of Ardersier? 2. What will the remaining money be spent on? The proposed site is on prime farmland and possibly a croft dating back many many decades ago. There are several natural springs, and there has been landslips and sink holes in this area. Have Springfield Civil Engineers looked at the drainage issues in this area. If they have, our local community council and villagers would like to see it. Also are their plans to upgrade the sewage infrastructure. Will our already poor broadband be affected by these additional 600 houses. And is this all going to be put in at the same time to avoid needless repeat roadworks. Water pressure will current residents be affected by the additional 600 houses. Footpaths and cycling paths to our nearest town Nairn with proper safety separation between cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Currently our bus routes are unreliable and few and far between. How long is the proposed building of 600 homes going to complete? How many entrances and exits to the building site? How many entrances and exits and where once the 600 houses site is completed? What will Springfield provide regarding care and maintenance of the roads to ensure any loose material and mud is reduced? Facilities- Ardersier School is at full capacity and the 600 homes would be overwhelming Culloden Academy is at full capacity with 33 pupils per class on average. 4 core subjects already have

had to be dropped from the curriculum.

There was a proposed fund allocated to address this, but the fund was used elsewhere. Doctors Surgery, Ardersier At present to get a doctors appointment, a wait of 4 to 6 weeks is commonplace, same at Nairn Surgery. I had an appointment with a doctor's request, with a 5 week wait, I week before my appointment the surgery cancelled it and then I had to wait another 4 weeks. We dont have a dentist here. We only have two small shops and if we were to become a town because of the extra 600 houses, these shops could face an increase in rates. Public Toilets in Ardersier - there was but Highland has sold the building recently. And what happened to that £10,000 may I ask? [second email] I wish to make a complaint in regards to the attached screenshot stating that we as residents in the village of Ardersier are in the minority" We have raised serious concerns about the proposed building of the 600 homes development by Springfield and lack of any planned infrastructure. "

Submission number

S-81-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I'm mailing to reject the application for an MCA for ardersier the very nature of a Mca is to give the building company a free rain to push through building house without due care of the community around it . I'm not against housing being built but it has to be in the correct way . With the MCA what happens when they don't do what they have said they will do due to it not being put in legal turns of planning are the council then legally bound to correct ie road access to present properties schools medical centres flood prevention etc. all ardersier residents stay in ardersier for a rural life for many reasons ( mental health anxiety of being in a crowded place, the elderly for a slower pace and those that love the country side and want to protect wild life ) then there's the farming land the country need for sustainability . Lastly who pays the ultimate price for the mistakes and failures of the MCA the residents Of Ardersier and the highland council as when the MCA are to make big profits we are left with a disfiguring village/ town Resident

Submission number

S-79-1

Consultee number

1401288

Date

16/02/2026

## Comments

I ask that the Highland Council remain accountable to their electorates for the provision of services, as set out in the Scottish Government's Local Government policies<sup>1</sup>. The ministerial foreword to the National Planning Framework (NPF4)<sup>2</sup> states: People care about their neighbourhoods and rightly and reasonably expect that new development should improve their lives, rather than undermining what they value most. There is no evidence that this development will facilitate this. At recent open meetings the community consensus has repeatedly raised objections to the proposed MCA at Ardersier, and I ask that the Councillors who represent the community support them. Two major themes have repeatedly become evident: 1. that this development is not wanted and should not go ahead

2. The MCA process at its current stage 2 is asking the community to make decisions without sufficient information, based on a red line around prime farmland fields. I would like to see the Ardersier development put on hold because: 1. It disregards NPF4 policies and has not been a part of long term plans for the area 2. The need for this housing cannot be justified 3. The MCA site serves only to benefit the developer and Highland Council, to the detriment of the local community. Reasons for this are outlined below: 1. This MCA site is not in the Highland Council's Development Plan, and is unnecessary according to the Local Places Plan. The NPF4 structure of LDPs and LPPs being used to inform planning decisions is being disregarded in what, for Ardersier, is a major development, altering the character of the village and building on prime farmland. Proposals on greenfield sites will not be supported unless the site has been allocated for development or the proposal is explicitly supported by policies in the LDP. 2 policy 9 The land proposed in the MCA was not in the Council's Development Plans in either 2015 or 2024. Ardersier does not yet have a LPP (Local Places Plan) to inform the Council Development plans, but the neighbouring Nairnshire LPP includes Port of Ardersier and discusses relevant housing needs. Because this MCA site is completely new and is out with recognised Development Plans, no discussion about the area has taken place with the community. No thought has gone into how it fits into the bigger picture. This 'bigger picture' involves ongoing and unfinished surrounding housing developments at Nairn, Tornagrain, and Stratton which encircle Ardersier. These were considered more than adequate to meet housing needs for the area and for the potential jobs that Ardersier Port might create over the next 10 years<sup>3</sup>. (Nairnshire LPP). 2. The MCA process People have chosen to live in Ardersier because it is a small village, surrounded by farmland and countryside, and for the Council to divert from published development plans is unfair. The proposed MCA site has not gone through the assessments it would if it was in the planning process, because with an MCA these assessments are council led and come later in the process. Consequently, the community has no evidence of the impacts of development, the mitigations, and no picture of what might be built there, and so cannot make an informed decision. Yet this MCA process proudly boasts 'community consultations' at the earliest stages. The principal of community involvement in an MCA is not being met. It feels rushed - the community only have 2 months to learn what is proposed, and have not been presented with any plans other than a boundary outline on empty fields, have no detail of where services, roads, access etc will be, nor what housing is proposed. There is not enough information for the community to make an informed decision. The MCA ideology is not met It is in Highland Council's interest to gain income from this development and the process feels rushed. The existing community will not benefit from this: it is for profit over people. Ongoing housing developments that surround Ardersier are far from complete which makes it unnecessary to begin a new one at Ardersier. The developer, and the Highland Council will both make a lot of

money from this development and together are powerfully pushing for this development. This is unfair because there is no objective party to advise local people in their input to the MCA process. The developers, Springfield, own the land and are pushing this through for profit over people. The reasons Springfield should not be granted permission to develop are listed separately 3. Need for workers' housing as an excuse to build: Ardersier Port is cited as the catalyst for doubling the size of Ardersier village, but its future is speculative. The number of jobs that the Port will create is unknown, and now in 2026, the majority of the workforce have either left or been laid off. As a Freeport, its very existence is subject to the policies of whatever political party is in power. In September 2024 The Green Party voted to oppose UK Freeports "The lack of transparency in decision making and reductions in environmental, planning and employment legislation are all factors that should alarm every UK citizen 4 . The Port is also damaging the environment. The dredging at Ardersier is already causing concern with its effects on the natural environment and coastal erosion, and this dredging will need to be an ongoing process due to longshore drift. The Port has applied to destroy further acres of countryside for industrial purposes without having a single contract in place, or is this simply a land grab? The owners of the Port applied to renew lapsed planning permission for 2000 houses to be built, so perhaps they know that their future as a port is uncertain. 4. Housing need as an excuse to build: The 'housing crisis' is also being used as an incentive to develop on the farmland around Ardersier. This is deception as experience of surrounding developments shows that only a very small minority of the homes built are suitable to alleviate local housing needs. New developments are being advertised in England, which means that Highland people either don't want or can't afford what is being built. Our neighbouring LPP informs us "housing need is minimal over the coming decade with the Highland population levelling and set to fall and local housing list demand mainly for small 1 -2 bed central units for rent 3 . "10,000 new homes already planned between Ardersier and Inverness at Tornagrain, Stratton, and Balloch, should be more than enough to accommodate the first wave of incoming workers during the 10 year scope of this first Nairnshire Local Place Plan 3 I would like to know why the existing massive build projects around Inverness over the last 20 years or so have not alleviated any of the alleged local housing shortage already? To sum up, I think any development at Ardersier should be paused until we have a LPP (Local Places Plan), and Highland Council have had time to consider it properly within a Local Development Plan.

These are the processes that we expect the Council to adhere to. Ardersier is already surrounded by half-built housing schemes within a few miles, which the Nairnshire LPP assessed as adequate for the next 10 years. There is no evidence that the Port will deliver the jobs it says it will. The proposed MCA site is on prime farmland, which we should not rush into destroying. Once it's gone it's gone. 1. Scottish Government's Local Government policies <https://www.gov.scot/policies/local-government/accountability-standards-councils/>. 2. NPF4 The National Planning Framework <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/> 3. Nairnshire LPP Easy read summary <https://www.ournairnshire.org/> 4. <https://greenparty.org.uk/2024/09/08/greens-vote-to-oppose-introduction-of-freeports-in-the-uk/> Comments re Ardersier proposed MCA Ongoing loss of local Prime farmland The Ardersier MCA site is not a brownfield site, which is the preferred option according to Highland Council and NDF4. Other brownfield sites exist, and it seems likely that the Port of Ardersier too may become housing in the future. The Ardersier MCA site is currently prime south facing farmland. We should be protecting this land locally as it is quickly being lost with: 1. current enormous housing developments that already ongoing within a few miles of Ardersier at Nairn, Tornagrain, Croy, and Smithton 2. the destruction of prime agricultural land for golf courses at Castle Stuart

in neighbouring parish of Petty 3. The nearby industrial site of Ardersier Port which, amongst other things, has replaced wildlife habitat with mountains of sand and has applied to increase the area for sand dumping into a new and extensive area of existing woodland. Why are Highland Council ignoring their own Development Plans and NDF4 and proposing to build on prime farmland? Ongoing loss of natural habitat This development significantly adds to the loss of natural habitat surrounding Ardersier, which includes: 1. Coastal habitat and farmland lost at the golf courses at Castle Stuart, and Nairn 2. Coastal habitat and seabed disturbance ongoing at Whiteness for industrial use for Port of Ardersier 3. the loss of woodland habitat at the Carse of Ardersier to provide storage for Port of Ardersier No Environmental Impact Assessment has been produced The Masterplan Consent Area in Ardersier is a hunting ground for birds of prey and habitat for a variety of wildlife – what we do not exactly know as there has been no environmental assessment. Radon mapping shows that the development site will require Radon protective measures. [redacted – unevicenced allegations about the development company], this needs monitoring to ensure it happens as required. How can this development enhance rather than destroy the natural environment, as per planning legislation. Flood risk and risk of sinkholes The development will disrupt current natural water courses and drainage. The farmland that the housing is to be built on absorbs and distributes large volumes of water in underground springs throughout the hillside, under the historic conservation area and out to sea. Test bores on Station Road have shown that the volume of water involved is significant. In the past there have been landslips. The water courses can change, for example there is now a stream visible at the bottom of the School Brae. The drains in old Ardersier frequently flood in periods of rain, which is particularly of concern in the conservation area, as the 18th century houses are at or below the same level as the modern roads. If development were to go ahead, I would ask that a large, wide belt of woodland is planted along the top of the hill above the conservation area. This would protect the conservation area from being overlooked by modern development and may help soak up the water in the hillside to alleviate flooding. It would also provide shelter from the fierce south-westerly winds and give the roe deer protection as they roam the hillside. No Environmental Impact Assessment has been produced. What guarantees can be given to ensure that the village will not suffer from disruption to the natural springs and drainage systems in the hillside? Protected and historic sites adjacent to the MCA site 1. Ardersier SSSI 2. The development lies between two medieval scheduled monuments and is on former Knights Templar land. Developing the farmland around these sites will increase footfall along the ‘Sandy Brae’ and up Cromal Hill – both of which are scheduled. 3. The boundary wall and markers from 1750 lie across the top of the MCA site. These are not currently on the Highland HER but I have made efforts to get them recorded there and with HES (Historic Environment Scotland) 4. There is evidence of pre-history activity in the area and I ask that an archaeological survey is carried out as the fields in question have never been surveyed 5. The 18th century part of Ardersier village is a conservation area, for which the planning laws require a much higher degree of scrutiny Loss of amenity: How does this new development meet the criteria set out in NDF4 policy 14 ? The MCA site is a part of the amenity of the Ardersier area for various reasons e.g.: 1. It is a peaceful and picturesque walk between the village and cemetery and around Cromal hill, or ‘the circuit’ along the beach to the Fort and back via the Baddock and cemetery. 2.

The size of village as it is now, is a reason people love and value living in Ardersier, and this development will destroy the village community feel 3. The open countryside is a reason people love and value living in Ardersier for their mental health and physical wellbeing 4.

The size of development is disproportionate to the historic village a. The increase in traffic - potentially over a thousand extra cars on our narrow roads b. More than doubling the size of the village c. Increased footfall / biking in current quiet outdoor spaces Infrastructure: Roads Roads and bridges approaching the site are unsuitable for construction traffic and unsuitable for the doubling of traffic that the doubling of the size of the village will bring.

The local single track roads are increasingly being used to divert traffic off the A96 due to continual roadworks and frequent road traffic incidents. It is not unusual to have to pull completely off the road to allow for large farming vehicles to pass. There is a new train station next to the airport, however the access roads from Ardersier is the narrow and dangerous B9039, with no provision for pedestrian or cycle traffic. The station car park is permanently full due to airport passengers using it as free airport parking, and so potential rail commuters are dissuaded from using it as a parking space for the day is unlikely to be available No traffic management plan has been produced Current road access to the A96 is inadequate for additional traffic: The B9006 (old military road) is the most direct access to the site from the A96. 1. It is too narrow to allow large vehicles to pass 2. There are soft verges either side of the narrow road 3. There are no pavements or paths for pedestrians and cyclists 4. The railway bridge has a weight limit of 7.5 tons 5. The Connage burn bridge is an 18th century stone construction, narrowed to single track 6. There are blind summits

7. There is a nursery school halfway along the road 8. The nearest exit to the A96 towards Inverness is a right turn across heavy traffic on a poorly lit staggered junction The B9092 'Nairn Road' is the site access from the east 1. In places it is too narrow to allow large vehicles to pass 2. There are soft verges either side of the road which in some places are very narrow 3. There are no pavements or paths for pedestrians and cyclists 4. There are blind corners The B9039 'Airport Road' is the site access from the west 1. There are soft verges either side of the road which in some places are very narrow 2. There are no pavements or paths for pedestrians and cyclists 3. There are blind corners and summits 4. There have been accidents and fatalities on this road, which have necessitated speed restrictions 5. The section named 'Nairn Road' in Ardersier village is effectively single track as the residents park on the north side of the street 6. Springfield promised then omitted to put in a pedestrian crossing, so there is no safe crossing point to the pensioner houses in Campbelltown or the new Springfield development at Connage The developer has a record of poor build quality and lack of integrity: Springfield should not be allowed to be the developer for this farmland or elsewhere in Highland: 1. They cannot be trusted to deliver what is promised: for example a. they have previously failed to deliver promised infrastructure in Ardersier at the Connage development b. Residents of the Connage development report that their Springfield built houses have structural problems and the company are not responding to their complaints. One was told her roof trusses were not strong enough to support solar panels. There are issues with damp. c. Springfield have [redacted – accepted blame and been fined for] the illegal dumping and burial of asbestos and [redacted – been accused of other dumping offences and silencing complainants].

The people who bought houses on these contaminated sites [redacted – may not have known about this issue]. [redacted – states that developer has undertaken unlawful activity and that Council should not be partnering with any organization that has]. Why was there no tendering process for this development?

Submission number

S-78-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I have seen nothing that gives me any confidence that this will be thoughtful, considered, sustainable, fitting with the environment and local community. There is no guarantee around improved infrastructure, in particular, surrounding roads and connections to the A96, cycle lanes, safe routes to Inverness/Nairn. The size, condition and access to the local school. Local gp access. Also local broadband. These should be in place before or as part of any new development and given Springfields track record of throwing up houses as fast as possible to maximise profit, they should contribute towards infrastructure development. The justification behind the MCA is noble but this is not about providing good quality, affordable housing to people who need it and all about a developer out to make as much money as quickly as possible with little consideration given to the local people who will be affected by it. For these reasons, I cannot support the plan.

Submission number

S-77-1

Consultee number

1401306

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

Ardersier is classed as a village. Most of us live here because it is rural. But if the proposed MCA goes ahead we will lose that. The proposed houses, would encroached our boundary, and we would be a town, instead of a historic fishing village. We do not have the infrastructure to cope with all the extra traffic. The proposed site is all single track roads. All that extra traffic coming through the village. Our school and GP surgery would not cope with all the extra people. Would the sewage works cope There is also an enviromental issue. That is prime agricultural land they want to use. In this day and age it would be better used for growing food What about the wildlife, that would lose their habitat. Also there is a lot of underground springs and Wells.

Shifting sands etc. Also there is Springfield themselves prosecuted for dumping oils and asbestos. Also their development in Ardersier is full of faults, a lot of the houses are damp. They were built on land that was always under water but never drained. Lastly our country way of life would be lost for ever.

Submission number

S-76-1

Consultee number

1401307

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I am writing to be part of the massive group of people who are strongly against the new housing development in Ardersier, 600 house would double the population and completely ruin the whole character of this historic village. We have no decent sized roads in or out of Ardersier, the school can't cope now and neither can the doctors surgery, to say they are not at capacity is nonsense, we don't even have a post office any more. Ardersier is being used as a fast money making scheme and where it is planned is completely the wrong place, it will not help the housing crisis in the highlands it will be incoming workers who have the

,money to afford one. This is a village with freedom to walk in country, know your neighbours, help others in the community, see wildlife and be safe doing this, the whole thing that we want for generations to come. This should never become a town its a travesty even being considered.

Submission number

S-75-1

Consultee number

1401279

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

To whom it may concern I'm writing for some clarification from the Highland Council on it's decision to allow Springfield Construction to propose Ardersier Mains as a possible site for 600 house's which will practically double the size of Ardersier a designated historic rural village. This development if it is allowed to happen will dramatically alter the landscape of our village forever. Also I would like to know why the housing scheme is being considered for prime agricultural land some of which (24 hectares) is still designated croftland surely there are better areas for these developments that does not adversely impact the local residents and remove productive farmland from the food chain forever. I look forward to hearing from Highland Council on these points. I'm writing to find out what you and Springfields proposals are regarding the building of 600 houses at Ardersier. It seems to me and other residents from the

meeting held previously in the war memorial hall that no thought has been put into this development other than profit for Springfield and Highland Council. With that in mind I would like to know what provision has been put in place regarding traffic management and roads going into the village? There are at present 3 roads coming into the village all come out onto the A96 a road which is already under pressure with no signs of upgrading until at least 2031. Will you be upgrading the current roads into the village? Bearing in mind that Highland Council has previously said it will only maintain the old military road up to Gollanfield as a single track road! It has a weak bridge with a weight restriction on it so is unsuitable for wide and heavy construction traffic. This will leave construction traffic and once the scheme is complete a further 1000+ cars trying to enter/exit the village at peak times. With that in mind will Springfield/Highland Council be providing new roundabouts onto the A96 for safe exiting from the village? This was done for the new houses at Delnies so should be done for the bigger development at Ardersier.

Also the greater portion of new residents will be driving to Inverness this will take them through the present village down Nairn Road and with a school on one side of the road will put children and elderly residents at risk when crossing this busy road. Springfield were supposed to have put in a crossing after building there previous 96 houses in the village they neglected to do so! I have no faith in any promises that Springfield will make to see their development happen. Doubling the size of a historic fishing village is surely not the way to solve the housing issues that are being dreamed up by the developers especially when current schemes at Stratton Farm, Nairn and Tornagrain are not at capacity and uptake has slowed down construction. Also it appears that no consideration has been given to how the construction of two storey buildings on the ridgeline over looking Inverness Airport will affect the Airports radar systems and its ability to function safely. My understanding is that the Airport has not been consulted about this Proposed MCA, why not. The reasons why this should not go ahead are far more numerous and if we had been afforded more time consultation they could be discussed openly with all the affected residents.

Submission number

S-74-1

Consultee number

1401308

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I am opposed to the MCA at Ardersier for the following reason The proposed development footprint is on prime agricultural land and in a time where we may need to produce more food this is bad site location at best and irresponsible at worst. 600 houses added to such a small village is just far too many, almost doubling the current population and changing the character of the village putting huge pressure on GP surgery and the Primary School. Why 600? Springfield Developments have been prosecuted (HSE case no 4474517) for environmental

dumping of [redacted – asbestos]. We have no faith or trust in a developer bringing these practices to a historic village close to a SSSI and ecological habitats. The roads network to and from the proposed site can in no way support either the construction traffic involved or the subsequent future addition of possibly 1000 vehicles commuting on a daily basis through a small Historic fishing village. Egress/Access via B9092 Nairn road has no safe crossing to the primary school, Old military road from Gollanfield is not a standard width and has a weak bridge (recently repaired). Historically there are underground springs crossing the proposed MCA that shift with weather events and the proposed area has always flooded, the fear is that any mitigation to alleviate this will allow a deluge of ground water to flow into village flooding housing and roads on High street. Water has always flowed across high street from the high ground and this can be observed at the bottom of school brae even during dry periods. If the development is going ahead on any scale it would be much less impactful if there was a buffer zone from the edge of the raised beach of 30 metres minimum. This would reduce the visual impact of the development and maintain a wildlife corridor along the edge of the cliffs. The loss of farmland and hedgerows is also detrimental to several species present on the proposed site including birds like corn bunting (UK red listed), grey partridge, lapwing, skylark, yellowhammer and starling.

Habitats will be affected at best and destroyed at worst affecting foraging areas and possible setts of badgers, barn and tawny owls, kestrels, roe deer and bat species.

Submission number  
S-73-1

Consultee number  
1401309

Date  
16/02/2026

#### Comments

Comments on proposed development site The proposed construction site is geologically a raised beach where a vast quantity of sand was pushed up from what is now Ardersier bay to form a large area of landed fronted by a steep cliff of sand. This is an isostatic rebound where land rises as the ice disappears at the end of the ice age form to form a raised beach. We understand that this is the finest example of this type of land formation anywhere in the UK. The raised beach can become unstable if it is saturated with water due to prolonged heavy rain and or poor land drainage. Climate change is now more likely to create conditions for instability. There was a landslip on the steep slope of the raised beach in 1933 and there is a photograph to confirm this event. I have no information on the time of year and the weather conditions prevailing at the time. For all those occupying buildings at the foot of the raised beach, on the High Street, there is a concern that a landslip could be caused by a change in the water table as a consequence of the proposed development. The lower section of Ardersier High Street is a Conservation Area with many listed buildings.

These were built shortly after the completion of Fort George in 1769. If any development does take place then it would need to set back well away from the steep sandy slope of the raised beach. Prior to works commencing a comprehensive land drainage scheme must be installed

with several drainage pipes taking water to a suitable connection point to bypass the steep sandy slope. There is an existing reservoir and pumping station, an access track and an 11kV power line which will need to remain in place. It is unlikely that the developer would be willing to pay the high cost of undergrounding the power line. Food sustainability is becoming a major concern and prime agricultural farmland should not be sacrificed in the same way as the Organic farmland was lost to create a golf course next to a recently constructed Championship course. To conclude the proposed site is not suitable as it puts an historic village at risk from landslips and overdevelopment. In addition, all road accesses to the village are restricted by narrow road widths and THREE bridge loading limitations and one height restriction. There is a double bend with a blind corner together with a recently constructed mini roundabout on the direct route to Nairn passing the Port of Ardersier. Joining the A96 is often very difficult and dangerous at peak traffic times. The relatively safe access point is the Inverness Airport roundabout on the A96, but even here there is no good line of sight view looking towards Inverness. The Gollanfield staggered junction requires street lighting as it is difficult to see the layout of the junction and the exit points at night especially if it is raining and there are headlights of approaching vehicles.

The new development would need a bus route running through it requiring adequate road width and bus stop laybys. Off road parking must be provided to ensure safe access for emergency vehicles. The railway line to Ardersier should be relaid on the existing embankment with a new Ardersier/Fort George station at the end of the embankment. A basic platform with lighting, a shelter together with steps and access ramp would be all that is required. Local trains would then loop in and loop out en route between Elgin and Inverness. This could be done on many other spur lines to coastal villages between Inverness and Fochabers! Reference to Ordnance Survey maps will show the improvements to public transport that could be made for everyone's benefit!

Submission number

S-72-1

Consultee number

1401310

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Masterplan Consent Area for 600 houses in Ardersier. This proposal represents a scale of development that is wholly disproportionate to the size and character of our small rural Conservation village. The impact on infrastructure, road safety, agricultural land, and the long-term sustainability of the community has not been adequately addressed. Ardersier is a historic village with a population of around 1,350 people. A development of 600 houses would fundamentally alter its character and effectively double its size. Growth on this scale would transform the village into something entirely different, without the necessary infrastructure in place to support such a change. There is no clear evidence that local services — including roads, public transport, healthcare, schools, drainage and utilities — have the capacity to

cope with a development of this magnitude. Development should only proceed where infrastructure is already in place or will be delivered alongside growth. That reassurance has not been provided. Transport is a significant concern. Bus links to Inverness and Nairn are already unreliable and subject to frequent changes. Access to the new train station near the airport relies on B-class rural roads, including the B9039, which already have safety and capacity issues. There have been serious accidents and fatalities on these roads, and traffic calming measures have recently been introduced. Adding the traffic generated by 600 houses — potentially around 1,000 additional vehicles — would place further strain on roads that are already struggling and would inevitably increase safety risks. The land identified within the proposed Masterplan Consent Area is prime agricultural land currently supporting working farms, livestock and crops. High-quality farmland is a finite resource and, once built on, it is lost permanently. At a time when food security and support for rural communities are increasingly important, the loss of productive agricultural land should not be taken lightly. The wider area has already seen substantial housing development at Tornagrain, Nairn, Croy and Smithton, with thousands of homes approved or under construction. Many of these developments are not yet complete, and it is unclear what level of housing need remains unmet. National planning policy promotes sustainable development and encourages the use of brownfield land wherever possible. In contrast, this proposal would result in the loss of valuable farmland in a location that lacks the infrastructure to support such expansion. There are also concerns about the use of the Masterplan Consent Area process for a development of this scale. The MCA approach limits the level of scrutiny and statutory involvement that would normally apply under a full planning application. Given the scale and long-term consequences of this proposal, a more transparent and rigorous process would be more appropriate. In summary, this proposal would significantly expand a village of around 1,350 people without the roads, services, or transport infrastructure needed to support it safely and sustainably. It would result in the permanent loss of prime agricultural land, place additional strain on already inadequate transport links, and increase traffic on rural roads with known safety concerns. Significant housing developments are already underway in surrounding areas, and it is premature to release further agricultural land before their impact has been fully understood.

Submission number

S-71-1

Consultee number

1399621

Date

16/02/2026

Comments

I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. Springfield is proposing to build 600 houses on a greenfield site, which is prime agricultural land. I was under the impression that the Highland Council has a general policy bias towards using brownfield land first, and that greenfield development is only typically considered as a last resort, where no alternative sites exist; it requires it to be justified through the Local Development Plan and demonstrate it to be sustainable. The planning officer cited the development of the Ardersier Port as justification for the development - there is a lot

of undeveloped land nearer the port that is not greenfield that could provide an alternative. Are greenfield applications not heavily scrutinised? - discouraging development on prime farmland/peatland - ensuring that proposals respect the landscape, natural heritage, and character of the immediate surroundings - ensuring there is adequate provision for water, sewerage, and road access - ensuring that the site is located outside areas at risk of flooding from sea, river, or surface water.

Submission number  
S-70-1

Consultee number  
1401276

Date  
16/02/2026

#### Comments

I wish to place on record my opposition to the proposed MCA. I feel the village is being used to try to bypass the proper planning permission. We have a population of approximately 1100, spread out across the village. Adding 600 houses, with an approximation of 2 per house would at least treble the population. Furthermore, it would add at least another 1000 cars to roads that were originally meant to take horses, not vehicles. Should the A96 ever get dualled, what road would said vehicles use to get to the A96? The old military road, with its weight restrictions, or the road by Haventus with its width restrictions? All roads around Ardersier have a lot of tractors going to the compactors at the airport, also many lorries going to and from the WWTP. Our roads are already overcrowded, we do not have the infrastructure to cope. Whilst I have sympathy with local families needing housing, I feel this would be better addressed by building 2-bed bungalows, both for sale and affordable rental, thereby allowing people to downsize as their families leave or their health deteriorates. This development is simply in the wrong place. Are you aware that the hill is mainly sand, and that there are active springs which may well compromise the safety of current residents, thereby potentially involving compensation claims should a landslip occur? There are at least 9 springs. Scottish Water have been trying for many years to fix problems in Fulmar Crescent. Furthermore, active ordinance was found by metal detection on Cromal Hill, and on two occasions Bomb Disposal Teams were called out to make them safe. Health and safety issues must be considered. We are close to Inverness Airport (formerly Dalcross), and higher buildings could impact on Radar. I understand Airport management haven't even been consulted, surely an omission on your part.

Submission number  
S-69-1

Consultee number  
1399621

Date  
16/02/2026

## Comments

I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. The Community Wealth Building Law has just been passed in Scotland. Its purpose is said to transform local economies by ensuring that wealth is retained within communities. It does bring into question how Springfield's development benefits the local community in line with the new law. A small percentage of the proposed housing development will be allocated for social housing, but the rest will put profits into the pockets of their shareholders. If Springfield cannot even make good on their promise to put in a zebra crossing on Nairn Road as part of their first development behind Fetter Road in the village - what other empty promises are they going to make? How are they giving back to the community? I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. Springfield is proposing to build 600 houses on a greenfield site, which is prime agricultural land. I was under the impression that the Highland Council has a general policy bias towards using brownfield land first, and that greenfield development is only typically considered as a last resort, where no alternative sites exist; it requires it to be justified through the Local Development Plan and demonstrate it to be sustainable. The planning officer cited the development of the Ardersier Port as justification for the development - there is a lot of undeveloped land nearer the port that is not greenfield that could provide an alternative. Are greenfield applications not heavily scrutinised? - discouraging development on prime farmland/peatland - ensuring that proposals respect the landscape, natural heritage, and character of the immediate surroundings - ensuring there is adequate provision for water, sewerage, and road access - ensuring that the site is located outside areas at risk of flooding from sea, river, or surface water. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier Character of the village: The proposed development will essentially double the size of Ardersier, which had a population size of 1176 according to the 2022 census. Since then, Springfield has already built 107 houses. This large proposed increase in population size will have a detrimental impact on the heritage, landscape and character of Ardersier, a small historic fishing village. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier Rural status of the village An increased population will lose Ardersier its rural status and affect local businesses through higher rates. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. The question around the effect these proposed 600 houses will have, built on the hillside, will have on the radar systems at the local Inverness Airport needs to be addressed. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier It appears that the proposed development area may be crofting land, as per the listing of I0056 and I0069 on the crofting register.

<https://www.crofting.scotland.gov.uk/applications-and-notifications/application-notification-types/whole-croft-decrofting/> I oppose the MCA in Ardersier Environmental Existing maps show that there are 4 springs, however, on older maps, 1 springs are listed, which rise through the geology of that site. Given the elevation of the site, the probability of flooding of the old village is significant. Ecology The ecological habitats in the proposed area will be affected. There are badgers, pine martens, and bats in and around the proposed development near the water tower, and all along the ridge past Cromal Hill. According to NatureScot, all bat species found in Scotland are classed as European protected species.

They receive full protection under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended). NatureScot has also reported that the Ardersier region hosts wintering waterfowl and breeding European shags, which are protected under the Moray Firth Special Protection Area. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier Environmental The area around the old station has been listed as 'contaminated' land due to the dumping of waste material from the train engines - Springfield has not listed any way to deal with this pollution in their application.

Submission number

S-68-1

Consultee number

1401277

Date

16/02/2026

### Comments

While I recognise the clear necessity for additional housing within the region, such growth must be delivered through a sustainable, infrastructure-led approach that genuinely benefits and integrates with the local community, rather than compromising its safety and viability; this submission outlines my objections to the Ardersier Masterplan Consent Area (MCA), detailing why a development of this unprecedented scale is fundamentally incompatible with the village's infrastructure, historic character, the environmental protections for local wildlife, and the statutory requirements of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4).

**1. Scale Footprint and Cumulative Impact** The proposal for up to 600 homes represents a major expansion that is fundamentally disproportionate to the existing scale of Ardersier. According to Scotland's Census 2022 the locality has a population of 1176 residents. The addition of an estimated 1400 new inhabitants would result in an unprecedented 119% increase in the settlement's size.

**Doubling the Built-Up Area of the Village** The development footprint is comparable if not bigger than the current village's total area; consequently this Masterplan Consent Area (MCA) would effectively double the built-up environment in a single project. Growth of this magnitude risks overwhelming local services and placing unsustainable pressure on infrastructure that was never designed for such rapid intensification.

**Cumulative Impact of Fort George Development** Crucially this proposal must not be viewed in isolation. The proposed sale of land by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) at Fort George for further residential development creates a significant cumulative impact. The combined effect of the MCA and the Fort George transition would:

- Saturate Local Infrastructure: Simultaneously taxing road networks sewage systems and healthcare facilities.
- Amplify Demographic Shift: Pushing the local population well beyond the village's carrying capacity and historic growth patterns.
- Erode Green Buffers: Removing the natural separation between historic military sites and the civilian community leading to suburban sprawl.

**The "Corridor of Growth" Pressure** The addition of 600 homes in Ardersier cannot be viewed as an isolated project. When combined with the simultaneous large-scale developments in Ardersier Port Nairn Balloch Tornagain Culloden West and Milton of Culloden it creates a profound cumulative burden across the entire A96 corridor. This "corridor of growth" is being expanded without the requisite strategic investment in the following key areas:

**Healthcare and Secondary Care** As previously noted Raigmore Hospital is frequently operating at 103% bed occupancy. The combined influx of thousands of new residents from these five major development zones risks a total service failure at the region's only acute facility while local GP and dental surgeries have no remaining "surge" capacity.

**Education and School Capacity** A 119% increase in the village population will inevitably lead to a breach of the local primary school's

capacity. The Council has provided no clear plan for:

- Educational Infrastructure and Capacity: There is a lack of evidence demonstrating that Ardersier Primary or the designated secondary schools Culloden Academy and Nairn Academy possess the capacity to absorb the projected student intake from this development. Culloden Academy in particular is already under extreme pressure due to significant ongoing housing developments within its catchment area. Without a clear strategy for rezoning or physical expansion further residential growth at this site is unsustainable and would be detrimental to the local educational standard.
- Safe Routes to School: The failure to deliver the promised zebra crossing for the previous estate underscores the developer's neglect of child safety in education-related infrastructure.

Road Network and Transport Safety The local B-road network and single-track lanes were never engineered for the volume of traffic generated by these combined developments. With over 1000 additional private vehicles and significant heavy construction traffic entering the network the cumulative impact will lead to:

- Gridlock at Key Junctions: Particularly where local routes feed into the already congested A96.
- Emergency Access Delays: An overstretched road network directly threatens the "Golden Hour" for emergency response times to the village.

2. Socio-Economic Impact: Reclassification and Loss of Identity The proposed expansion would force a fundamental shift in Ardersier's status reclassifying it from a "Rural Village" to a "Small Town" under Scottish Government Urban Rural Classifications. This transition poses two critical risks: Erosion of Rural Protections A "Small Town" designation strips the community of distinct rural planning protections. Unlike an organic incremental growth process this developer-led expansion offers no transitional support to preserve the village's unique character or identity. Withdrawal of Vital Business Support Reclassification creates a financial "cliff-edge" for local services. As a rural settlement (population under 3000) Ardersier's businesses currently qualify for 100% Mandatory Rural Rate Relief. Shifting to "Small Town" status would:

- Abolish Tax Relief: Lifeline services—including the general store post office and local pub—would lose their 100% business tax exemption.
- Threaten Commercial Viability: Increased overheads without phased tax support risk the closure of independent businesses turning a self-sustaining village into a hollowed-out "commuter town."

3. Statutory Duty and Conservation Status Ardersier is a historic Conservation Village. The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 places statutory duties on local authorities to ensure a higher degree of scrutiny for development within or adjacent to such areas specifically requiring that character and appearance be preserved or enhanced. Furthermore because the site falls within a 15km radius of a safeguarded airport any development is subject to strict statutory safeguarding requirements. Under the relevant safeguarding directives the local planning authority has a duty to consult with airport operators to ensure that new structures do not compromise aerodrome safety or interfere with navigational aids. Given the elevation of the proposed site this scrutiny is particularly critical but this was not mentioned at the January meeting The developer proposes to construct on Cromal Hill a site of significant archaeological interest situated near a Scheduled Monument protected under The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. As the highest and most prominent point in the area the visual impact would be profound. When viewed from the seaward side proposed properties would "stand proud" over the existing Conservation Area creating a permanent scar on the historic skyline. It is contended that a "streamlined" Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC) or simplified application process which avoids the rigorous public and statutory scrutiny of a Full Planning Application is entirely inappropriate for a site of such extreme cultural archaeological and aviation sensitivity.

4. Developer Conduct and Environmental Risks The community expresses grave concerns regarding the documented record of the developer Springfield Properties PLC.

- HSE Prosecution: The developer was successfully prosecuted and fined by the Health and Safety Executive (Case No.

4474517) following guilty pleas related to the mismanagement of asbestos. • Judicial Findings: In a judgment concluded on August 26 2025 (CSOH 81) the Court of Session found the developer had committed an "egregious wrong" by using a wrongful interim interdict to silence a contractor Mr. Martin McGowan who had raised valid safety concerns. • Failure to Deliver Promised Infrastructure: The developer's track record regarding local community support is equally concerning. Promises made to mitigate the impact of previous developments have not been honored. Specifically for the new Ardersier estate a zebra crossing was promised to ensure pedestrian safety for children; however this vital infrastructure was never delivered. This failure to deliver compromises community safety. • Lack of Transparency: During the public meeting on January 14 2026 representations regarding land ownership were evasive. While the developer's representative claimed the land was "under contract Highland Council's own records identify the site owner (Area 197) as Springfield Properties. This lack of transparency undermines the credibility of the entire MCA process. 5. Hydrogeology, Drainage, and Geological Risk The proposed elevated area contains a significant number of streams, wells, and a historic reservoir documented in the Highland Historic Environment Record. • Springs and Saturation: Local water springs emerge on and around the site, contributing to persistent ground saturation. Development risks disrupting these natural pathways and redirecting spring water toward existing homes at the base of the hill. • Geological Instability: The Cromal Hill consists of sand and gravel, not solid bedrock. A significant landslide occurred here in 1933 (local pictures are available), demonstrating the historical vulnerability of the slope. Large-scale earthworks risk destabilising the bank further and risk established properties. • Historic Significance: The 1902 Queen Victoria Chalybeate Well, a listed memorial protected by Historic Environment Scotland, was historically served by the natural reservoir on Cromal Hill. 6.

Conflict with NPF4 and Protection of Prime Agricultural Land The Site and Regulatory Context The development site consists of prime agricultural land (PAL) protected under The Agriculture and Rural Communities (Scotland) Act 2024. PAL as a National Resource National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) classifies prime agricultural land as a finite national resource. There is a strong presumption against its use for housing; development is only permitted under narrow, exceptional circumstances. To date, no such justification has been proven for this site. Regional Precedents and Cumulative Loss The continued erosion of PAL in this corridor is reaching a critical threshold. Significant portions of high-quality land have already been sacrificed for the Tornagrain development, Nairn expansions, and the A96 dualling project. Given this extensive regional loss, the protection of remaining, unused PAL must be treated as a priority, not an afterthought. The failure to protect this specific site ignores the cumulative impact on Scotland's long-term food security and rural landscape. In a volatile geopolitical climate where food security is a matter of national resilience, the permanent destruction of PAL for a disproportionate development is strategically reckless and directly violates the sustainability principles of NPF4. Unfinished Developments There are currently several incomplete sites in the region including a number managed by Springfield Properties. Until these existing projects are finalised and their impact on local housing needs is fully assessed, the destruction of an additional greenfield and prime agricultural site is premature and unjustified. Brownfield-First Approach National policy mandates the prioritisation of brownfield redevelopment. Choosing to destroy greenbelt land for profit while viable brownfield alternatives remain underutilised is a direct violation of the sustainability principles enshrined in NPF4. 7. Ecological Importance, SSSI Status, and Soil Health The development is in extreme proximity to the SSSI (Site Code 71), protected under The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004. The site supports protected Badgers (1992 Act), Bats (1994 Regulations), and Birds of Prey (1981 Act). Furthermore, it is a

habitat for moles, essential for soil aeration and natural drainage (NPF4 Policy 5). The risk of injury or mortality to these animals during earthworks would be a violation of the Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996.

8. Infrastructure, Road Capacity, and Public Safety Ardersier is served by minor B-roads and single-track routes. Despite long-standing promises, the A96 remains unduelled, and the local network is already struggling with current demands.

- Single-Track Constraints: Several routes surrounding Ardersier are single-track lanes with restricted visibility and geometry unsuitable for high volumes of traffic. These routes are incompatible with heavy construction traffic, residential volume (1,000+ vehicles), and emergency access.
- Regulatory Alignment: The proposal fails to align with Transport Scotland's Rural Road Safety Framework. Adding 600 homes to this inadequate network represents a safety risk that has not been mitigated.

9. Procedural Unfairness and Rushed Consultation The MCA process feels fundamentally rushed, with the community requested to provide comment on a complex new legal mechanism with minimal information or guidance. This mechanism circumvents the statutory involvement of the Local Community Council, which would be guaranteed under a Full Planning Application.

10. Public Health and Infrastructure Deficits The Danger of "Dormitory Settlements" Highland Council's pursuit of aggressive housing targets aiming for 24,000 new homes over the next decade prioritises numerical "units" over holistic community health.

This approach risks transforming Ardersier into a "dormitory settlement": a community lacking the local infrastructure services and green spaces necessary to sustain the mental and physical wellbeing of its residents.

Critical Strain on Secondary Care (Raigmore Hospital) The scale of this development poses a severe risk to regional acute care. Raigmore Hospital is already operating under extreme duress with frequent reports of 103% bed occupancy. These "code black" conditions result in cancelled elective surgeries and escalated A&E wait times. Adding 600 homes in Ardersier while simultaneously developing Nairn Balloch Tornagrain and Culloden West and Milton of Culloden creates a cumulative burden that the regional healthcare system is not equipped to absorb.

Healthcare and Dental Capacity Primary care and dental services are at a breaking point. According to Audit Scotland (2023) regional growth is pushing community health services beyond safe operating capacities. Local dental provision is already so overstretched that this expansion threatens a total collapse of access for both new and existing residents. The Statutory Consultation Gap Critically NHS Highland is not a statutory consultee in the planning process. This "consultation gap" allows major housing proposals along the Nairn–Ardersier–Tornagrain–Culloden corridor to be advanced in isolation. Without mandatory NHS input on hospital GP dental and emergency services capacity the Council is approving developments without a full understanding of the resulting healthcare deficit.

Lack of Mitigation The current MCA fails to offer any concrete commitments to:

- Expand GP and Dental Provision: No infrastructure is planned to meet the inevitable surge in demand.
- Provide On-site Facilities: There is no allocation for health or dental hubs within the development.
- Phased Development: There is no mechanism to ensure housing delivery is synchronised with healthcare capacity upgrades. The proposed expansion of Ardersier represents more than just a housing project; it is a fundamental threat to the environmental economic and social fabric of a historic Conservation Village. The evidence presented underscores a profound misalignment between the developer's "streamlined" ambitions and the statutory protections afforded by NPF4 the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act and the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act.

Final Position A project of this magnitude which doubles the village footprint and risks the destruction of Prime Agricultural Land requires the highest level of statutory scrutiny. The use of a Masterplan Consent Area (MCA) to bypass a Full Planning Application is inappropriate given the cultural archaeological and aviation sensitivities of the site. Growth must be organic sustainable and

infrastructure-led. This proposal in its current form is a developer-led imposition that prioritizes numerical housing targets over the safety identity and wellbeing of the Ardersier community. It should therefore be rejected in favour of a "brownfield-first" approach that respects the limits of the village's carrying capacity."

Submission number

S-67-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

13/02/2026

Comments

Ardersier is a small rural and historic Conservation Village with a tight knit community who place great value on their cultural identity as a rural and farming community. This disproportionate, insensitive and legally risky Masterplan Consent Area development is objected to for a number of reasons. Now that the Beauly site at Fennelan has been objected this puts into question the contract signed by SSEN and Springfield to provide housing on their new builds to supply incoming workers with accommodation that will no longer be coming into the area. Ergo the case put forward as to provide incoming workers from SSEN and the freeport is no longer viable and at the very least should be put on hold. Ardersier is a very small village with minor B roads as access/egress to the main A96 road (which has not yet been duelled despite promises from Scottish Government) and with single track roads with passing places connecting the B roads. None of these B roads have footpaths for safe pedestrian travel, nor are there cycle paths. There are working farms and prime agricultural land on the green belt area completely surrounding Ardersier and valuable woodland which is teeming with wildlife. Ardersier is steeped in military history due to its location alongside Fort George. There are a number of monuments protected by law and Ardersier is completely surrounded by areas of natural beauty which are home to animals which are also protected by law. Cromal Mount is a significant medieval site which is a scheduled monument protected by The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The proposed MCA runs alongside this important historical site. There is a well known badgers set along Cromal Hill (adjoining the proposed MCA site) and it is very common to observe the animals whilst out walking in the farmlands above the village.

Badgers are protected by The Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Badgers setts are also protected under The Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011. There are bat roosts in many of the farm buildings around the proposed Masterplan Consent Area. In Scotland, all species of bats and their roosts are legally protected under The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 and NatureScot is the Governing body responsible for issuing protected species licences when any development or action is proposed which may affect bats or their roosts. Surveys require to be carried out by professional Ecologists to establish impact. In addition, the area above the proposed Masterplan Consent Area in Ardersier is a hunting ground for protected birds of prey who are also protected by The Wildlife and Countryside Act

1981. Watching these majestic birds is a privilege and one which must be protected. This is prime agricultural land and in a time where we may need to produce more food this is bad site location at best and irresponsible at worst.

Springfield Developments have been prosecuted (HSE case no 4474517) for environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation] we have no faith or trust in a developer bringing these practices to a historic village close to a SSSI and ecological habitats, nor are we happy that the Highland council condone and support a developer who practices in such work ethos. Springfield Developments [rephrased - unsubstantiated allegation] attempted an interim interdict of a contractor who found asbestos on a site at Milton of Campsie. The contractor won his case for compensation on Aug 26th 2025 after Springfield developments were successfully prosecuted and fined by HSE. We therefore have no trust that local contractors will not be met by the same working practices. The integrity of the developer and Highland council is questionable as when at the 14th Jan meeting, [rephrased – personal details] the developer's lead representative was asked "did they own the the land? he replied it was "under contract" which left the community none the wiser. According to Highland Council local development plan area 197 as of May 2025 the site bidder is shown as Mr Stuart Morrison and site owner Springfield properties, The Highland council(HC)made no attempt to correct Mr Morrison and was clearly at best clueless or at worst trying to avoid confrontation to an already bad situation. This lack of transparency leads us to believe that nothing that HC or springfield developments can be believed reference future schools, roads network etc. The roads network to and from the proposed site can in no way support either the construction traffic involved or the subsequent future addition of possibly 1000 vehicles commuting on a daily basis through a small Historic fishing village. Egress/Access via B9092 Nairn road has no safe crossing to the primary school, Old military road from Gollanfield is not a standard width and has a weak bridge (recently repaired) Historically there are underground springs crossing the proposed MCA that shift with weather events and the proposed area has always flooded, the fear is that any mitigation to alleviate this will allow a deluge of ground water to flow into village flooding housing and roads on High street. Water has always flowed across high street from the high ground and this can be observed at the bottom of school brae even during dry periods. Ecological habitats will be affected at best and destroyed at worst namely, the badgers along cromal hill, The bats in the farm buildings, the birds of prey feeding on field mice, voles and moles etc If this is a possible" MCA at ardersier Why has the land already been purchased by springfield properties? A Masterplan Consent Area is entirely the wrong mechanism to suggest utilising for any development in such an area and a Full Planning Application is what Highland Council need to be proposing to consider any development whatsoever in this important historic Conservation area. The proposal of an MCA in Ardersier would result in established planning safeguards being removed and this is in direct contravention to the principles of Scotlands current plan-led planning system. This objection does not oppose development in principle but opposes the appropriateness of the MCA mechanism for this disproportionately large and legally risky plan on this particular site. There is a Site of Special Scientific interest (SSSI site - code 71) located around Fort George and along towards Cromal Hill and the village. This SSSI is of huge ecological importance and has provided significant important ecological data. The SSSI is primarily protected in law by The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004. SSSI site code 71 will continue to be subject to further studies gathering research around ice sheet history the behaviour of the Moray Firth Ice Stream relative sea level changes and glacier deposition. SSSI site code 71 is incredibly close to where Highland Council and Springfield Developments are proposing this large development is situated therefore

making the streamlined approach of an MCA proposal to be completely inappropriate. A Full Planning Application process is required to consider this crucial factor and to ensure Compliance with Legal and Conservation Obligations and to ensure no harm is done to these important and delicate areas. When considering any possible developments in areas around SSSI's there are a number of considerations which Local Authorities are legally obligated to consider. The following are just some of the assessments which may require to be carried out - Impact Risk Zones (IRZ's) Habitat Regulations Assessments Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's). Detailed Surveys from Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) also need to be carried out and consultation with SNH needs to be undertaken to determine the sensitivity of the SSSI's features and the potential impact of a huge development alongside it. These studies and considerations should ensure that development plans respect the natural heritage of SSSI's and do not compromise the delicate balance of Scotlands protected areas. Ardersier is a Conservation village and the proposed Masterplan Consent Area site for Ardersier is sitting on the adjoining border of the Conservation line designated by The Highland Council in May 1996. The purpose of Conservation status is to ensure that Ardersier's areas character and appearance is preserved protected and enhanced. The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 places statutory duties on Local Authorities namely The Highland Council to ensure a much higher degree of scrutiny when considering any and all building within or surrounding Conservation areas. How then can a faster and more streamlined approach to planning (avoiding much of the scrutiny which is considered and offered in a Full Planning Application) such as an MCA even be a consideration by The Highland Council when considering risks and impact on this historic Conservation area of a disproportionately large development. It is entirely inappropriate to even consider using the MCA process. The National Planning Policy framework in Scotland states that brownfield sites should be the preferred development sites for Local Authorities sites which already have good access/egress and accessible infrastructure shops/schools/GP surgery. There are more appropriate sites closer to the A96 and Inverness/Nairn (where infrastructure is already in place to absorb potentially over 2000 people) rather than profit driven developers choosing to destroy green belts prime farmland natural habitats and Conservation areas. Ardersier has no infrastructure in place to support a disproportionate development of this size and scale. Presently there are approximately 1350 people living within this small rural and historic Conservation community with working farms and prime agricultural land all around us. It is a small tight knit community and we greatly value our rural peaceful way of life. A development of 600 houses would have a catastrophic impact on the rural village way of life it would turn us into a town and without any infrastructure whatsoever to support this huge change. Many people specifically live here for the peace and tranquility of living around wildlife and woodlands and in small communities. Public Transport links to and from Inverness and Nairn from Ardersier are already woefully inadequate and buses are subject to regular and ongoing changes meaning they remain completely unreliable and have been for years. There has been a new train station built next to the airport however the roads which people would require to travel on to access this train station are B roads which already experience regular road traffic accidents and there have been a number of deaths on these roads. There has recently been traffic calming measures implemented on the B9039 following road deaths. These small roads barely cope with the traffic they currently experience never mind adding another 600 houses with the possibility of around 1000 more vehicles requiring access/egress and requiring to commute to places of work. This would be unsafe and would cost more lives. The area where this Masterplan Consent Area is being considered is prime agricultural land with several working farms livestock living there and crops being farmed on the land. We are living in times where we need to produce more fresh food and farming

communities and green belt areas are crucial areas to protect and preserve for future generations not to destroy in the pursuit of profit with minimal scrutiny of plans. Farmers and their way of life are protected by The Agriculture and Rural Communities (Scotland) Act 2024. The surrounding area has already lost huge areas of farming and agricultural land with the enormous development of land creating thousands of houses at Tornagrain Nairn Croy and Smithton. Many of these developments are unfinished to be able to actually assess and establish what housing need still remains. It is not necessary to continue developing on valuable green belt and farming/agricultural land and destroying Conservation areas and farming communities. Highland Council should be following the National Planning Policy framework of building on brownfield sites where infrastructure is already in place or at least is more accessible than at Ardersier. The MCA process feels too rushed and with insufficient time and insufficient crucial information for the community to be properly involved in something which will massively affect their way of life. A Full Planning Application process would also enable the local Community Council to be involved on a Statutory basis which an MCA process prevents. The 3 access and egress routes into/out of this MCA site to the A96 (B9039 B9006 B9092) are all very small narrow B roads which are already shared with farming vehicles and machinery. Its not unusual to have to pull completely off the road to allow for large farming vehicles to pass. To potentially add another 1000 cars commuting in and out of this small peninsula area is at best ludicrous and at worst highly dangerous. The main commuting route into and out of the village to Inverness and passing the airport (B9039) has already been subject to traffic calming measures has very regular road traffic accidents and very sadly several accidents have resulted in deaths on this road. The other 2 routes (B9006 & B9092) are insufficiently wide enough in points to allow two vehicles to pass safely and there are unending farm vehicles using these roads as they go about their business of tending to the land and animals. An MCA process is completely inappropriate to utilise in a green belt area where full transparent assessments of roads are not available for members of the community to scrutinise. The proposed Masterplan Consent Area is an area adjoining Ardersier on an elevated position directly ontop of this Conservation village. Local Authorities have specific Duties and Responsibilities when considering any planning around Conservation areas.

Conservation areas are legally protected by The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. Ardersier local knowledge is being disregarded as was demonstrated in the meeting in Ardersier with Highland Council and Springfield Developers on 14 January. Local people are aware of and expressed concerns about our knowledge of a huge number of streams and wells and a historic reservoir in this proposed elevated MCA area all of which can be viewed on the Highland Historic Environment Record. Historically the properties which run along the base of this hill (a hill which you propose to build upon) relied upon the local springs and wells to source their water. In 1902 the Queen Victoria drinking fountain was erected in the village square as a Chalybeate Well to celebrate Queen Victorias reign and it still stands there today protected by Historic Scotland on their statutory list as an important Historical Memorial in our Conservation village. The Queen Victoria fountain was served by the natural reservoir directly ontop of Cromal Hill in the farmland you propose to build on (reservoir visible clearly via National Library of Scotland mapping). When considering a development on an elevated position with houses directly underneath it and on land where there are known to be natural reservoirs springs and wells then surely the Local Authority has a Duty to ensure full drainage investigations and assessments are carried out and that these are available for the community affected to scrutinise? It is critical for any new development to undertake a number of specific assessments and to be transparent with the community which may be impacted. It is also

crucial for any new development to offer Site Specific Evidence (providing calculations and water management plans) and to include and gain consents from the Statutory body SEPA. Drainage Impact Assessments (DIA's) Flood Risk Assessment (FRA's) and Surface Water Drainage Assessments (Sud's) are all necessary when considering the legislation Local Authorities require to adhere to. The Flood Protection (Scotland) Act 1961 & The Flood Prevention & Land Drainage (Scotland) Act 1997 places a Duty on the the Local Authority namely The Highland Council who require to publish this crucial information in the planning phases. Any assessments undertaken must be provided by companies and organisations with no affiliation to Local Authority or to Developers so as to ensure that advice is independent and not biased. An MCA process means that the local community who may be directly impacted will not have the opportunity to establish the risks associated with a large development above and alongside them. The residents living all along the High Street and Fulmar Crescent have Common Law rights and these rights seem to be getting overlooked in the MCA process. A Full Planning Application process would be a more transparent and appropriate process to consider this and allow residents of this village to make informed decisions it would also allow the Community Council to act in a Statutory capacity which they cannot do with an MCA. When considering this Masterplan Consent Area proposal it is important to consider the Developers who Highland Council are proposing to carry out the building of the properties on the site particularly on a site in a Conservation village where stringent measures are enforced by Local Authorities to ensure integrity preservation and protection should be of the utmost importance. The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour when considering establishing an evidence base to assess future Risk. The Springfields Developer Properties Group are a company who have demonstrated on a number of occasions that they do not act with integrity and in fact have acted criminally. A developer who behaves with such a lack of integrity and who demonstrates criminal behaviour should not be involved in any future development and definitely not one which will potentially completely destroy a small rural Conservation community and destroy swathes of natural habitat and farmland around it. Springfields Developers were fined by the Health Service Executive (Case number 44745117) for breaching Health and Safety laws for the environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted - unsubstantiated allegation]. Springfields boast of selling high quality homes yet court documents highlighted their concealment of dangerous and deadly substances which they then used as backfill [unsubstantiated allegations]. Springfields Developers attempted to silence a [rephrased - defamatory language] contractor about these dangerous practices and issued him with an interim interdict. The contractor had tried to inform people buying homes about the dangers and to express concern about risks to his employees who were expected to work as contractors on site without the appropriate PPE when dealing with dangerous substances. The [redacted – personal details] contractor alleged [redacted - unsubstantiated allegation] several years of bullying and intimidating behaviour resulting in his mental health being adversely affected. Following Springfields being successfully prosecuted and paying a HSE fine the contractor pursued a civil legal case against Springfields in the Scottish Court of Sessions. The contractor was awarded a very substantial amount of compensation [redacted - unsubstantiated allegation] for personal and professional damages. There is a class lawsuit being pursued by the contractors involved in handling the deadly waste which remains ongoing in January 2026. There has already been a Springfields development in the village of Ardersier launched in 2020 albeit a much smaller one than proposed at the MCA site. As a village we are still integrating all the new families and people into our community. This new development is not without problems and many of the people living there in the "high quality homes" Springfields claim to have built are reporting living in substandard quality homes and are experiencing unending

issues with plumbing/drainage/internal and external mould/gardens flooding and who are getting absolutely no assistance from Springfields as soon as the ink was dry on their purchase agreements (despite Springfields After Sales promises). Another example of substandard building came from a lady living in one of the Springfields homes in Ardersier who had a Solar Panel assessment carried out on her home with a view to having Solar Panels installed. She was advised that the trusses Springfields had used in her roof were not sufficiently strong enough to hold Solar Panels so yet again this highlights the poor build quality from Springfields. [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation]. In terms of Infrastructure to support the MCA we will no doubt hear about numerous promises made by Springfields as they look to push this profit driven development forward. It is over 5 years on from Springfields first development of houses in Ardersier and the infrastructure they promised to provide to ensure children can safely get to school via a Pelican Crossing linking their development to the rest of the village has not been built. This means children are risking their lives each day trying to cross a busy road to reach their school (a road which would be considerably busier should the MCA go ahead with the potential for an additional 1000 cars travelling in and out the village). I will say once again the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour and we have thus far evidenced nothing but a lack of integrity a lack of help and a lack of interest in supporting infrastructure from Springfields [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation]. Does the Highland Council offer any assurances that dealing with Springfields during an MCA development will be any different for our community? This development is disproportionately large and should not be approved by Highland Council planning. Highland Council should be severing ties with a developer [rephrased - unsubstantiated allegation] that has a track record like Springfield's and should be seeking to use the streamlined MCA process on established brownfield sites with infrastructure already in place certainly not at historic rural Conservation areas like Ardersier. We object to the Ardersier MCA on the grounds that it represents a premature disproportionate and legally risky removal of established planning safeguards contrary to the principles of Scotland's plan-led planning system. Our objection does not oppose development in principle but changes the appropriateness of the MCA mechanism for this site. Loss of scrutiny and accountability. The MCA would remove the requirement for individual planning applications and case by case scrutiny by elected members and the public. Impacts may only be discovered far down the line. The scale and duration is particularly concerning here Once consent is granted there is no way to revisit impacts without revoking or amending this MCA. This is very unlikely to happen. This MCA assumes delivery of appropriate and required infrastructure... transport health utilities etc. There will be no commitment or leverage through the normal planning obligations. Government and Highland Council will have to pick up the tabs for infrastructure after Springfield has finished with the profit making part. This MCA permits development without normal planning safeguards. No matter the number of unlimited objections it cannot be refused or redesigned. Risk in all aspects will be borne by our Community not by Springfield. The MCA will grant advance consent for many years even decades. Once it is approved our community will not be able to challenge anything. There will be nothing we can do regarding poor house designs and poor or non existent infrastructure. Our own Councillors should be caring about the loss of decision making powers. They will have no leverage to change things and it is them that will ultimately get the blame anyway. Ardersier MCA is setting a precedent that Councillors cannot change in the future. They will simply be spectators to the debacle. I ask that the Highland Council remain accountable to their electorates for the provision of services as set out in the Scottish Government's Local Government policies. 1. The ministerial foreword to the National Planning Framework (NPF4)<sup>2</sup> states: People care about their neighbourhoods and rightly and reasonably expect that new development should improve their lives rather than

undermining what they value most. There is no evidence that this development will facilitate this. At recent open meetings the community consensus has repeatedly raised objections to the proposed MCA at Ardersier and I ask that the Councillors who represent the community support them.

Two major themes have repeatedly become evident: 1. that this development is not wanted and should not go ahead 2. The MCA process at its current stage 2 is asking the community to make decisions without sufficient information based on a red line around prime farmland fields. We would like to see the Ardersier development put on hold because: 1. It disregards NPF4 policies and has not been a part of long term plans for the area 2. The need for this housing cannot be justified 3. The MCA site serves only to benefit the developer and Highland Council to the detriment of the local community. Reasons for this are outlined below: 1. This MCA site is not in the Highland Council's Development Plan and is unnecessary according to the Local Places Plan. The NPF4 structure of LDPs and LPPs being used to inform planning decisions is being disregarded in what for Ardersier is a major development altering the character of the village and building on prime farmland. Proposals on greenfield sites will not be supported unless the site has been allocated for development or the proposal is explicitly supported by policies in the LDP. 2 policy 9 The land proposed in the MCA was not in the Council's Development Plans in either 2015 or 2024. Ardersier does not yet have a LPP (Local Places Plan) to inform the Council Development plans but the neighbouring Nairnshire LPP includes Port of Ardersier and discusses relevant housing needs. Because this MCA site is completely new and is out with recognised Development Plans no discussion about the area has taken place with the community. No thought has gone into how it fits into the bigger picture. This 'bigger picture' involves ongoing and unfinished surrounding housing developments at Nairn Tornagrain and Stratton which encircle Ardersier. These were considered more than adequate to meet housing needs for the area and for the potential jobs that Ardersier Port might create over the next 10 years. (Nairnshire LPP). 3. The MCA process People have chosen to live in Ardersier because it is a small village surrounded by farmland and countryside and for the Council to divert from published development plans is unfair. The proposed MCA site has not gone through the assessments it would if it was in the planning process because with an MCA these assessments are council led and come later in the process. Consequently the community has no evidence of the impacts of development the mitigations and no picture of what might be built there and so cannot make an informed decision. Yet this MCA process proudly boasts "community consultations at the earliest stages" The principal of community involvement in an MCA is not being met. It feels rushed the community only have 2 months to learn what is proposed and have not been presented with any plans other than a boundary outline on empty fields have no detail of where services roads access etc will be nor what housing is proposed. There is not enough information for the community to make an informed decision. The MCA ideology is not met It is in Highland Council's interest to gain income from this development and the process feels rushed. The existing community will not benefit from this: it is for profit over people. Ongoing housing developments that surround Ardersier are far from complete which makes it unnecessary to begin a new one at Ardersier The developer and the Highland Council will both make a lot of money from this development and together are powerfully pushing for this development. This is unfair because there is no objective party to advise local people in their input to the MCA process. The developers Springfield own the land and are pushing this through for profit over people. The reasons Springfield should not be granted permission to develop are listed separately 3. Need for workers' housing as an excuse to build: Ardersier Port is cited as the catalyst for doubling the size of Ardersier village but its future is speculative. The number of

jobs that the Port will create is unknown and now in 2026 the majority of the workforce have either left or been laid off. As a Freeport its very existence is subject to the policies of whatever political party is in power. In September 2024 The Green Party voted to oppose UK Freeports "The lack of transparency in decision making and reductions in environmental planning and employment legislation are all factors that should alarm every UK citizen. The Port is also damaging the environment. The dredging at Ardersier is already causing concern with its effects on the natural environment and coastal erosion and this dredging will need to be an ongoing process due to longshore drift. The Port has applied to destroy further acres of countryside for industrial purposes without having a single contract in place or is this simply a land grab? The owners of the Port applied to renew lapsed planning permission for 2000 houses to be built so perhaps they know that their future as a port is uncertain. Housing need as an excuse to build: The 'housing crisis' is also being used as an incentive to develop on the farmland around Ardersier. This is deception as experience of surrounding developments shows that only a very small minority of the homes built are suitable to alleviate local housing needs. New developments are being advertised in England which means that Highland people either don't want or can't afford what is being built. Our neighbouring LPP informs us "housing need is minimal over the coming decade with the Highland population levelling and set to fall and local housing list demand mainly for small 1-2 bed central units for rent. 10000 new homes already planned between Ardersier and Inverness at Tornagrain Stratton and Balloch should be more than enough to accommodate the first wave of incoming workers during the 10 year scope of this first Nairnshire Local Place Plan We would like to know why the existing massive build projects around Inverness over the last 20 years or so have not alleviated any of the alleged local housing shortage already? To sum up I think any development at Ardersier should be paused until we have a LPP (Local Places Plan) and Highland Council have had time to consider it properly within a Local Development Plan. These are the processes that we expect the Council to adhere to.

Ardersier is already surrounded by half-built housing schemes within a few miles which the Nairnshire LPP assessed as adequate for the next 10 years. There is no evidence that the Port will deliver the jobs it says it will. The proposed MCA site is on prime farmland which we should not rush into destroying. Once it's gone it's gone.

Submission number

S-66-1

Consultee number

1401189

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

Ardersier is a small rural and historic Conservation Village with a tight knit community who place great value on their cultural identity as a rural and farming community. This disproportionate, insensitive and legally risky Masterplan Consent Area development is objected to for a number of reasons. Ardersier is a very small village with minor B roads as access/egress to the main A96

road (which has not yet been duelled despite promises from Scottish Government) and with single track roads with passing places connecting the B roads. None of these B roads have footpaths for safe pedestrian travel, nor are there cycle paths. There are working farms and prime agricultural land on the green belt area completely surrounding Ardersier and valuable woodland which is teeming with wildlife.

Ardersier is steeped in military history due to its location alongside Fort George. There are a number of monuments protected by law and Ardersier is completely surrounded by areas of natural beauty which are home to animals which are also protected by law. Cromal Mount is a significant medieval site which is a scheduled monument protected by The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The proposed MCA runs alongside this important historical site. There is a well known badgers set along Cromal Hill (adjoining the proposed MCA site) and it is very common to observe the animals whilst out walking in the farmlands above the village. Badgers are protected by The Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Badgers setts are also protected under The Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011. There are bat roosts in many of the farm buildings around the proposed Masterplan Consent Area. In Scotland, all species of bats and their roosts are legally protected under The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 and NatureScot is the Governing body responsible for issuing protected species licences when any development or action is proposed which may affect bats or their roosts. Surveys require to be carried out by professional Ecologists to establish impact. In addition, the area above the proposed Masterplan Consent Area in Ardersier is a hunting ground for protected birds of prey who are also protected by The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Watching these majestic birds is a privilege and one which must be protected. A Masterplan Consent Area is entirely the wrong mechanism to suggest utilising for any development in such an area, and a Full Planning Application is what Highland Council need to be proposing to consider any development whatsoever in this important historic Conservation area. The proposal of an MCA in Ardersier would result in established planning safeguards being removed and this is in direct contravention to the principles of Scotland's current plan-led planning system. This objection does not oppose development in principle but opposes the appropriateness of the MCA mechanism for this disproportionately large and legally risky plan on this particular site. Ardersier is a Conservation village and the proposed Masterplan Consent Area site for Ardersier is sitting on the adjoining border of the Conservation line designated by The Highland Council in May 1996. The purpose of Conservation status is to ensure that Ardersier's areas character and appearance is preserved, protected and enhanced. The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 places statutory duties on Local Authorities, namely The Highland Council, to ensure a much higher degree of scrutiny when considering any and all building within or surrounding Conservation areas. How then can a faster, and more streamlined approach to planning (avoiding much of the scrutiny which is considered and offered in a Full Planning Application) such as an MCA even be a consideration by The Highland Council when considering risks and impact on this historic Conservation area of a disproportionately large development. It is entirely inappropriate to even consider using the MCA process. The National Planning Policy framework in Scotland states that brownfield sites should be the preferred development sites for Local Authorities, sites which already have good access/egress and accessible infrastructure shops/schools/GP surgery. There are more appropriate sites closer to the A96 and Inverness/Nairn (where infrastructure is already in place to absorb potentially over 2000 people) rather than profit driven developers choosing to destroy green belts, prime farmland, natural habitats and Conservation areas. Ardersier has no infrastructure in place to support a disproportionate development of this size and scale.

Presently, there are approximately 1350 people living within this small rural and historic Conservation community with working farms and prime agricultural land all around us. It is a small tight knit community and we greatly value our rural, peaceful way of life. A development of 600 houses would have a catastrophic impact on the rural village way of life, it would turn us into a town and without any infrastructure whatsoever to support this huge change. Many people specifically live here for the peace and tranquillity of living around wildlife and woodlands and in small communities. Public Transport links to and from Inverness and Nairn from Ardersier are already woefully inadequate and buses are subject to regular and ongoing changes meaning they remain completely unreliable and have been for years. There has been a new train station built next to the airport, however the roads which people would require to travel on to access this train station are B roads which already experience regular road traffic accidents and there have been a number of deaths on these roads. There has recently been traffic calming measures implemented on the B9039 following road deaths. These small roads barely cope with the traffic they currently experience, never mind adding another 600 houses with the possibility of around 1000 more vehicles requiring access/egress and requiring to commute to places of work. This would be unsafe and would cost more lives. The area where this Masterplan Consent Area is being considered, is prime agricultural land with several working farms, livestock living there, and crops being farmed on the land. We are living in times where we need to produce more fresh food and farming communities and green belt areas are crucial areas to protect and preserve for future generations, not to destroy in the pursuit of profit with minimal scrutiny of plans. Farmers and their way of life are protected by The Agriculture and Rural Communities (Scotland) Act 2024. The surrounding area has already lost huge areas of farming and agricultural land with the enormous development of land creating thousands of houses at Tornagrain, Nairn, Croy and Smithton. Many of these developments are unfinished to be able to actually assess and establish what housing need still remains. It is not necessary to continue developing on valuable green belt and farming/agricultural land and destroying Conservation areas and farming communities. Highland Council should be following the National Planning Policy framework of building on brownfield sites, where infrastructure is already in place, or at least is more accessible than at Ardersier. The MCA process feels too rushed and with insufficient time, and insufficient crucial information for the community to be properly involved in something which will massively affect their way of life. A Full Planning Application process would also enable the local Community Council to be involved on a Statutory basis, which an MCA process prevents. The 3 access and egress routes into/out of this MCA site to the A96 (B9039, B9006, B9092) are all very small, narrow B roads which are already shared with farming vehicles and machinery. Its not unusual to have to pull completely off the road to allow for large farming vehicles to pass. To potentially add another 1000 cars commuting in and out of this small peninsula area is at best ludicrous, and at worst highly dangerous. The main commuting route into and out of the village to Inverness and passing the airport (B9039) has already been subject to traffic calming measures, has very regular road traffic accidents and very sadly, several accidents have resulted in deaths on this road. The other 2 routes (B9006 & B9092) are insufficiently wide enough in points to allow two vehicles to pass safely and there are unending farm vehicles using these roads as they go about their business of tending to the land and animals. An MCA process is completely inappropriate to utilise in a green belt area where full transparent assessments of roads are not available for members of the community to scrutinise. The proposed Masterplan Consent Area is an area adjoining Ardersier on an elevated position directly on top of this Conservation village. Local Authorities have specific Duties and Responsibilities when considering any planning around Conservation areas.

Conservation areas are legally protected by The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. Ardersier local knowledge is being disregarded, as was demonstrated in the meeting in Ardersier with Highland Council and Springfield Developers on 14 January. Local people are aware of and expressed concerns about our knowledge of a huge number of streams and wells and a historic reservoir in this proposed elevated MCA area, all of which can be viewed on the Highland Historic Environment Record. Historically, the properties which run along the base of this hill (a hill which you propose to build upon) relied upon the local springs and wells to source their water. In 1902, the Queen Victoria drinking fountain was erected in the village square as a Chalybeate Well, to celebrate Queen Victoria's reign, and it still stands there today, protected by Historic Scotland on their statutory list as an important Historical Memorial in our Conservation village. The Queen Victoria fountain was served by the natural reservoir directly on top of Cromal Hill in the farmland you propose to build on (reservoir visible clearly via National Library of Scotland mapping). When considering a development on an elevated position, with houses directly underneath it, and on land where there are known to be natural reservoirs, springs and wells, then surely the Local Authority has a Duty to ensure full drainage investigations and assessments are carried out and that these are available for the community affected to scrutinise? It is critical for any new development to undertake a number of specific assessments and to be transparent with the community which may be impacted. It is also crucial for any new development to offer Site Specific Evidence (providing calculations and water management plans) and to include and gain consents from the Statutory body SEPA. Drainage Impact Assessments (DIA's), Flood Risk Assessment (FRA's) and Surface Water Drainage Assessments (Sud's) are all necessary when considering the legislation Local Authorities require to adhere to. The Flood Protection (Scotland) Act 1961 & The Flood Prevention & Land Drainage (Scotland) Act 1997 places a Duty on the Local Authority, namely The Highland Council, who require to publish this crucial information in the planning phases. Any assessments undertaken must be provided by companies and organisations with no affiliation to Local Authority or to Developers, so as to ensure that advice is independent and not biased. An MCA process means that the local community, who may be directly impacted, will not have the opportunity to establish the risks associated with a large development above and alongside them. The residents living all along the High Street and Fulmar Crescent have Common Law rights, and these rights seem to be getting overlooked in the MCA process. A Full Planning Application process would be a more transparent and appropriate process to consider this and allow residents of this village to make informed decisions, it would also allow the Community Council to act in a Statutory capacity, which they cannot do with an MCA. When considering this Masterplan Consent Area proposal, it is important to consider the Developers who Highland Council are proposing to carry out the building of the properties on the site, particularly on a site in a Conservation village where stringent measures are enforced by Local Authorities to ensure integrity, preservation and protection should be of the utmost importance. The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour when considering establishing an evidence base to assess future Risk. The Springfields Developer Properties Group are a company who have demonstrated on a number of occasions that they do not act with integrity and in fact have acted criminally. A developer who behaves with such a lack of integrity, and who demonstrates criminal behaviour should not be involved in any future development, and definitely not one which will potentially completely destroy a small rural Conservation community and destroy swathes of natural habitat and farmland around it. Springfields Developers were fined by the Health Service Executive (Case number 44745117) for breaching Health and Safety laws for the environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted - unsubstantiated allegation]. Springfields boast of selling high quality homes, yet

court documents highlighted their concealment of dangerous and deadly substances which they then used as backfill under their Scottish developments. [redacted - unsubstantiated allegation]. There has already been a Springfields development in the village of Ardersier launched in 2020, albeit a much smaller one than proposed at the MCA site. As a village, we are still integrating all the new families and people into our community. This new development is not without problems and many of the people living there in the high quality homes" Springfields claim to have built are reporting living in substandard quality homes and are experiencing unending issues with plumbing/drainage/internal and external mould/gardens flooding and who are getting absolutely no assistance from Springfields as soon as the ink was dry on their purchase agreements (despite Springfields After Sales promises). Another example of substandard building came from a lady living in one of the Springfields homes in Ardersier who had a Solar Panel assessment carried out on her home with a view to having Solar Panels installed. She was advised that the trusses Springfields had used in her roof were not sufficiently strong enough to hold Solar Panels

Submission number

S-63-1

Consultee number

1401177

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

Understanding it all As far as I can understand it a Masterplan Consent Area is designed to help speed up and streamline the planning process. To help reduce red tape and administration consents on large projects. Section 12. Masterplan Consent Areas are a new consenting mechanism where the planning authority proactively sets out, and grants consent, in an MCA 'scheme' for development it wishes to be delivered, subject to any conditions REF: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/masterplan-consent-areas-guidance/pages/2/>. In a broad sense, as a small builder, that makes perfect sense to us. We do believe the current system is over-burdened in bureaucracy and administration – and that to create a proactive, streamlined service will help to speed up development. There is a massive BUT in this. At what cost? At the cost of changing the entire integrity of a small historic village? At the cost of leaving new housing development home owners with sub-standard properties and no proper back up procedure? Development of villages should be thoughtful, considered, sustainable, fitting with the environment and history, fair to the industry, local community and the new house owners. Housing Crisis There appears to be substantial political pressure on councils to meet targets for Housing Delivery and the government is keen to speed up the process of building houses. But, Scottish Government statistics for Sept 25 show that: "In Scotland there are 20,927 second homes, 44,453 properties empty for more than 6 months and liable for Council Tax and 44,989 properties with unoccupied exemptions from Council Tax. Ref: <https://www.gov.scot/news/empty-and-second-homes-in-september-2025/> Is it not then

perhaps a different problem? Shelter Scotland tells us that... “private renters navigate a minefield of increasing unaffordable rents and poor conditions. Families are cramped into overcrowded homes and we're forced to pay over the odds for damp, mouldy, or dangerous homes that are making us sick. The bottom line is the absence of good quality, affordable social housing is denying people across Scotland the chance of a decent home. REF: [https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/campaigning/what\\_is\\_the\\_housing\\_emergency](https://scotland.shelter.org.uk/campaigning/what_is_the_housing_emergency) I hear from many people that the new Ardersier Springfield homes which are only 4 years old have problems with damp and mould. AND THESE ARE NEW HOUSES! Why are we allowing these developers to walk away, wash their hands of any sub-standard workmanship, count their millions of pounds of profits, and leave us a legacy of problem houses to deal with in the future on our own? These Springfield developments are not going to fix this housing crisis. Springfield houses are only going to create further future problems in the housing market, further depress an already depressed rental market, sell houses to the highest bidder, increasing their already huge profits and whitewash communities and councils about their inputs to add necessary infrastructure requirements and improvements by including them in plans but not actually help to provide any of them – (or check back that they have been done.) Infrastructure and quality of work The last development of over 100 houses in the village of Ardersier has not been thoughtful, considered, sustainable, fitting with the environment and history, fair to the industry, local community and the new house owners. It is a flat pack, low quality, quickly thrown together housing estate, which we forecast will bring lots of work to local tradesmen like us in the future. And while we will be able to potentially ‘fix’ issues, like sticking plasters we will only ever be able to help reduce symptoms, as we believe these houses have been built too quick, thereby allowing insufficient quality control and oversight of process. Equally, the promised infrastructure has not appeared because apparently the local council doesn’t have the powers/money to commit to do any of it. Why have none of the roads in and out of the village been improved? Why are we still pulling out of the Castle Stuart junction onto a busy A96? Why does the local school have a portacabin taking up space in the playground? Why do our kids have to take their lives into their hands to cross a busy road to get to school? Why is it so difficult to make an appointment to see a dentist or a doctor? What has actually been improved/provided by the high profit developer/council in terms of infrastructure to service all the 100 new houses because actually I see nothing at all. This MCA proposal in its own words MUST conform with what they are being asked to do: Section 22. specifically: MCAs can be used to consent housing and will be able to unlock significant areas for housing development. Providing upfront planning consent through MCAs can allow faster build out of housing developments and required supporting infrastructure. MCAs can be used in urban areas, and to support delivery of rural homes and alternative delivery models such as custom and self-build. Section 54C specifically highlights that MCA schemes can authorise self-build housing. REF: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/masterplan-consent-areas-guidance/pages/2/>. But this should be in place before, or at the very least, during, the build process. I would even question why that must be the responsibility of the council? If the council is being given the powers to set conditions why not force the developer to reduce their profits and build the promised necessary infrastructure themselves together with and to the council’s own specification. We know that the council has ongoing procurement issues and obviously the developer has plenty access to sub-contractors.

Currently, Springfield, the big developer in this case, walk away, and the house owner’s charity housing associations, government and local council have to pick up the tab. There is nothing good about this. The developer takes the chance to break rules because taking fines is cheaper.

They continually 'pass the buck' for responsibility on ongoing snagging and sub-standard work practices to unwieldy insurance and housing association call centres so that home owners eventually just 'give up' and decide to either live with it or pay for it themselves. I challenge the council housing department employees, (who make such important decisions on our behalf,) to walk through Ardersier Springfield estate and Tornagrain, (particularly the first few houses built), and really sit down and talk to the residents finding out their experiences. I can help point them in the right directions because I do talk to a lot of people about their experiences, and that is without even trying to find anyone. Should we not expect quality, attention to detail, properly worked out solutions, and infrastructure going above and beyond what is initially promised? This is why I cannot support the plan for 600 homes to be built by Springfield Homes on the edge of the historic village of Ardersier. Other ways to do it There are other ways to do it. There are other country's we can look to. For a very simple example, I am aware of a similar MCA type of system in a small village in South Germany, whereby the local authority has permission and retains control of local land on the edge of any development /village/town, and has the ability to create an unambiguous, clearly defined rule book for any development within that land. The land is then opened up in sections to local builders, self-builders, and small developers with priority given to people with connections to the area, probably a bit like how the Highland Council currently chooses council housing need. This type of approach makes sense, the development still goes ahead but it is with careful, thoughtful and sustainable progress. Section 22. specifically: MCAs can be used to consent housing and will be able to unlock significant areas for housing development. Providing upfront planning consent through MCAs can allow faster build out of housing developments and required supporting infrastructure. MCAs can be used in urban areas, and to support delivery of rural homes and alternative delivery models such as custom and self-build. Section 54C specifically highlights that MCA schemes can authorise self-build housing. REF: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/masterplan-consent-areas-guidance/pages/2/>.

Submission number

S-62-1

Consultee number

1401174

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

As an Ardersier resident and home owner I have serious concerns about the proposed housing development suddenly presented to the community on 14 January 2026. One of my concerns being: The very short timeline given to the community to digest the enormity of this housing development and to understand the MCA process by which it is being decided. We are told that this process gives us a "say" about a suddenly revealed large housing development which has enormous implications on a number of fronts for our community and our Village. However this process does not give us enough time or future based information to consider as individuals or as a community what our "say" should be about this large housing development or its impact on us and our Village. I object to the development for this reason. I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed housing development on the following grounds: In the Highland Council Inner

Moray Firth Development Plan published June 2024 Ardersier is described as a small fishing village of 1200 people.."" where "Much of the available development land within the settlement is impacted by flood risk and/or a high water table. However planning permission was granted in December 2019 for 117 homes to the south of the village. This represents the principal expansion site for the village. Alongside this there are a number of smaller scale redevelopment and infill development opportunities." (Italics and bold type my own) Yet in May of 2025 less than a year of this being published Springfield Developments put a contract on a piece of land larger than the actual village and is mooted up to 600 houses on this site. This development is being blessed and promoted by the Highland COuncil even though it goes against its own planning of less than two years ago which indicated that the recent addition of 117 homes was the principal expansion site for the village with only smaller sites and infill developments put forward. In addition the 2024 planning document referenced known flood risks in the village yet the development is to be placed above the village on land with a complex network of seasonal water tables and a history of extensive efforts to mitigate these by past and current residents.

If the Council cannot stick with its own planning advisories and forecasts for Ardersier Village then I have no faith in the soundness and integrity of Council planning and promoting this MCA development for Ardersier

Submission number

S-61-1

Consultee number

1401173

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

[redacted – personal details] I stringly object to proposed housing development on that land: • It is prime south facing farmland, something we are quickly losing locally with current enormous ongoing developments that already surround Ardersier at Nairn, Tornagrain, Croy, and Smithton • It is a peaceful and picturesque walk between the village and cemetery • One reason given to build is local need. This, and the continuing development across Highland, is not meeting local need. There is an inequality in wages and house values across the UK. Consequently, properties in Highland are rarely available for local families, prices have risen to meet the demand from 'down south', and homes are being snapped up by investors and people from south of Highland. The proliferation of second homes, and holiday lets adds to this problem. The current developments around Ardersier are not yet complete and, like this proposal, are not meeting local housing needs, but are being sold to people from outwith Highland, whose families will also require housing in the future. By building housing that locals cannot afford, the population of Highland is increased by incomers and so the alleged housing crisis will never resolve. This is already happening in Ardersier: within the 19 apartments and houses around my home I have 10 holiday rentals, 5 second homes which lie empty for all or part of the year, and only 4 properties which are the owners' main and only residence. This rips the heart out if a community and has lost a potential 15 family homes. • This development significantly adds to

the loss of natural habitat surrounding Ardersier, which includes:

- Coastal habitat and farmland lost at the golf courses at Castle Stuart, and Nairn
- Coastal habitat and seabed disturbance ongoing at Whiteness for industrial use for Port of Ardersier
- the loss of woodland habitat at the Carse of Ardersier to provide storage for Port of Ardersier
- The development will disrupt current natural water courses and drainage. The farmland and trees along the hill absorb and distribute water in underground springs throughout the hillside above the historic conservation area and out to sea. Test bores have shown that the volume of water involved is large.
- Proximity to a SSSI
- The development lies between two medieval scheduled monuments and is on former Knights Templar land
- It is not a brownfield site, which is the preferred option according to Highland Council. Other brownfield sites exist.
- The open countryside is a reason people love and value living in Ardersier for their mental health and physical wellbeing
- The size of village as it is now, is a reason people love and value living in Ardersier, and this development will destroy the village community feel
- The size of development is disproportionate to the historic village:

- The increase in traffic - potentially over a thousand extra cars on our narrow roads
- More than doubling the size of the village
- Increased footfall / biking in current quiet outdoor spaces
- Current road access to the A96 is inadequate for additional traffic: it is single track
- bridges are vulnerable and have weight limits
- There are no pavements
- The nearest exit to the A96 towards Inverness is a right turn across heavy traffic on a poorly lit staggered junction

I would rather any new development went through planning procedures and not an MCA

- so that proper environmental impact assessments and archaeological investigations can be carried out
- So the community council can have statutory input
- The principal of community involvement in an MCA is not being met. It feels rushed - the community only have 2 months to learn what is proposed, and have not been presented with any plans other than a boundary outline on empty fields, have no detail of where services, roads, access etc will be, nor what housing is proposed. There is not enough information for the community to make an informed decision. The MCA ideology is not met. Springfield should not be allowed to be the developer for this farmland or elsewhere in Highland:
- They cannot be trusted.
- Springfield have been charged in court for the illegal dumping and burial of asbestos [redacted - unsubstantiated allegation].
- Why was there no tendering process for this development? All these and many other reasons suggest that this development should not go ahead.

Submission number

S-60-1

Consultee number

1401172

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

[redacted – personal details]. I strongly object to proposed housing development on that land:

- It is prime south facing farmland, something we are quickly losing locally with current enormous ongoing developments that already surround Ardersier at Nairn, Tornagrain, Croy, and Smithton
- It is a peaceful and picturesque walk between the village and cemetery
- One reason given to build is local need. This, and the continuing development across Highland, is not meeting local need. There is an inequality in wages and house values across the UK. Consequently, properties in Highland are rarely available for local families, prices have risen to meet the demand from 'down south', and homes are being snapped up by investors and people from south of Highland. The proliferation of second homes, and holiday lets adds to this problem. The current developments around Ardersier are not yet complete and, like this proposal, are not meeting local housing needs, but are being sold to people from outwith Highland, whose families will also require housing in the future. By building housing that locals cannot afford, the population of Highland is increased by incomers and so the alleged housing crisis will never resolve. This is already happening in Ardersier: within the 19 apartments and houses around my home I have 10 holiday rentals, 5 second homes which lie empty for all or part of the year, and only 4 properties which are the owners' main and only residence. This rips the heart out of a community and has lost a potential 15 family homes.
- This development significantly adds to the loss of natural habitat surrounding Ardersier, which includes:
  - Coastal habitat and farmland lost at the golf courses at Castle Stuart, and Nairn
  - Coastal habitat and seabed disturbance ongoing at Whiteness for industrial use for Port of Ardersier
  - the loss of woodland habitat at the Carse of Ardersier to provide storage for Port of Ardersier
  - The development will disrupt current natural water courses and drainage. The farmland and trees along the hill absorb and distribute water in underground springs throughout the hillside above the historic conservation area and out to sea. Test bores have shown that the volume of water involved is large.
  - Proximity to a SSSI
  - The development lies between two medieval scheduled monuments and is on former Knights Templar land
  - It is not a brownfield site, which is the preferred option according to Highland Council. Other brownfield sites exist.
  - The open countryside is a reason people love and value living in Ardersier for their mental health and physical wellbeing
  - The size of village as it is now, is a reason people love and value living in Ardersier, and this development will destroy the village community feel
  - The size of development is disproportionate to the historic village:
- The increase in traffic - potentially over a thousand extra cars on our narrow roads
- More than doubling the size of the village
- Increased footfall / biking in current quiet outdoor spaces
- Current road access to the A96 is inadequate for additional traffic:
  - it is single track
  - bridges are vulnerable and have weight limits
  - There are no pavements
  - The nearest exit to the A96 towards Inverness is a right turn across heavy traffic on a poorly lit staggered junction
- I would rather any new development went through planning procedures and not an MCA
- so that proper environmental impact assessments and archaeological investigations can be carried out
- So the community council can have statutory input
- The principal of community involvement in an MCA is not being met. It feels rushed - the community only have 2 months to learn what is proposed, and have not been presented with any plans other than a boundary outline on empty fields, have no detail of where services, roads, access etc will be, nor what housing is proposed. There is not enough information for the community to make an informed decision. The MCA ideology is not met. Springfield should not be allowed to be the developer for this farmland or elsewhere in Highland:
- They cannot be trusted.
- Springfield have been charged in court for the illegal dumping and burial of asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation].
- Why was there no tendering process for this development? All these and many other reasons suggest that this development should not go

ahead.

Submission number

S-59-1

Consultee number

1401170

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

There is a considerable confusion in the community regarding the concept of an MCA and why Ardersier. This area has been included as a potential MCA as the primary and secondary school are not at capacity both the schools have temporary classrooms because of overcrowding, The proximity to Ardersier Port. At the moment there is not the immediate requirement of houses for any employees at the site. There are sites nearer to the port already with houses planned. The infrastructure particularly the roads are not suitable for the approximately 800 cars coming in and out of the proposed MCA either to Inverness or Nairn, another 800 cars feeding onto the A96, will the roads be upgraded to allow for extra traffic. This should also be planned before planning is authorised. The hospitals, Doctors and Dentists in this area are severely overloaded another development of 600 houses will just exasperate the matter even further. Profit before people. I understand the need for housing, but planning cannot be approved on this scale without the infrastructure being in place to accommodate the rise of approximately 1500 people to an already over populated area. I feel that the Highland Council and the Scottish Government have to address these issues before this is given the approval for being an MCA

Submission number

S-58-1

Consultee number

1401156

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

Environmental The 'ardersier boards' pdf available on the highland council website show pipes running through and next to Cromal mount site. This concerns me as the late medieval fortification will be destroyed by the company. Public Opinion. I do not believe that the MCA process has not been done in Scotland before it's clear that THC are unfamiliar with the process

and the developer is rushing into a project which would double the size of Ardersier without due process. The Community wealth building law (2026) - this development extracts wealth from Ardersier and enriches Springfield shareholders and property speculators. I believe that this opposes the law that's just been passed in Holyrood and extracts wealth from the many to enrich the few. Springfield have not committed to social housing, keeping families in the village or any other form of public benefit as well as Springfields commitments about zebra crossings for the kids from their existing McPherson drive development have come to nothing. The proposed developer (who may have contract on the Getti/ Beattie fields have lost an asbestos case in November) - [Martin McGowan v Springfield Properties Plc] With the way they have behaved during the development of 107 houses in Ardersier already I believe there are no grounds to trust this organisation in any way. Except below from the court papers: Relations between the parties soured when the pursuer began raising health and safety concerns with the defender, notably around the presence of asbestos on certain of their sites. He did this by way of direct communication, letter, email and text over a period of some months. He asserted, put very shortly, that the defender had known about the presence of asbestos, had done nothing about it, and had allowed men, including the pursuer's teams, to work on sites contaminated with asbestos. No suitable PPE for working in the presence of asbestos was provided to those working on the sites. Matters came to a head when the pursuer emailed the defender on 1 February 2016 repeating these concerns. Concerns were raised separately by certain of the pursuer's employees with the health and Safety Executive, who began an investigation. The defender raised McGowan v Springfield Properties Plc, 2025 WL 02446912 (2025) © 2026 Thomson Reuters. 2 proceedings for interdict and interim interdict founding on the allegations made by the pursuer, which they asserted were untrue and defamatory. Interim interdict was pronounced on an ex parte basis on 5 February 2016. 4. In around October 2020, the defender was prosecuted and pled guilty to certain Health and Safety offences relating to the presence of asbestos on certain of their sites. They received a fine in respect of those offences. Shortly thereafter the pursuer lodged with the court in the action for Interdict a number of documents he asserted demonstrated that the sting of the allegations that he had made were true. In May 2021, some 5 years after the interim interdict had been pronounced, it was recalled of consent and a joint minute entered into in terms of which the pursuer was granted decree of absolvitor in his favour. The proposed development site is a perfect agricultural site. Less than two miles away there is a massive brownfield site in Haventus port of Ardersier where 2000 houses have been approved. Within the THC committee papers dated Nov 2025 Empty Homes strategy the document lists significant amount of houses which are already available, if tax policy and political will exists.

MingYang the proposed purchaser of the Port intends to use external labour for offshore wind generation. Public opinion Ardersier has 1100 residents in the available census - an addition of 600 houses will double the size of the village. Springfield (the nominated developer) has already built 107 houses. There are no current plans to provide further facilities like local gp practices, shops, or plans to expand the primary school all of these current facilities in Ardersier would not be able to cope with a population double its current size. The radar systems in the Airport will be affected by buildings placed on the ridge behind station road which faces the airport. A picture dated from 1933 shows a landslip near Fulmar crescent - the rising springs on the Fulmar crescent road. The developer intends to shut the road between Fulmar crescent and the Mains of Ardersier farm - this will divert the water flows in the substrate underneath the site and endanger the existing buildings in Ardersier. This is clear evidence that there is a lack of planning and consideration for the current residents of Ardersier. There are 4 springs currently

listed on existing maps however on older maps 11 springs are listed that are rising through the geology of that site. Given the elevation of the site the probability of flooding of the old village is significant. This should be a serious concern that is being overlooked. The boundary walls built in the 1700 delimiting the fort border, these will be destroyed by the developer as they have not yet been classified as a scheduled monument as they should be. As a resident of Ardersier I have seen and photographed many animals such as badgers, bats and pine martins along with many others in the proposed development area near the water tower. The MCA proposal allows the developer to destroy these animals habitat.

Infrastructure For the construction The current road access in and out of Ardersier is inadequate for the size of the development. The Gollanfield road has a weight restriction on the railway bridge. The Ardersier / Airport road will require HGV to travel up the 'Nairn road' within Ardersier blocking pedestrian traffic as well as endangering kids walking to and from school as there is no safe crossing point. The 'nairn road' between Ardersier and Nairn is narrow and already cannot cope with the current bus traffic - HGVs will cause further deterioration of the surface. After the construction if the population of Ardersier doubles then the existing inadequate roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. We know that the council have no budget and no budget to work on anything other than the Inshes roundabout - and chips and tar for all the potholes. Environmental Currently there are Crofts I0056 and I0069 that form part of the proposed area. They have not been decrofted yet and still have not gone through due process. Environmental The land around the old station has been listed as 'contaminated' land due to the dumping of waste material from the train engines - Springfield has not listed any way to deal with this pollution in their application. There should be a decisive plan for dealing with this before development can be considered.

Submission number

S-57-1

Consultee number

1401153

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

Environmental and Historical The 'Ardersier boards' pdf available on the Highland Council website shows pipes running through and next to the Cromal mount site. This company will destroy and degrade the late medieval fortification. The MCA process has not been done in Scotland before (as far as I can tell). It's clear that THC are unfamiliar with the process, and the developer is using this to rush through a doubling of the size of Ardersier without due process. The community of Ardersier has not been involved with these major decisions impacting their lives and standard of living. Community wealth building law (2026) - this development extracts wealth from Ardersier and enriches Springfield shareholders and property speculators. I believe that it runs directly counter to the law that's just been passed in Holyrood and extracts wealth from the many and enriches the few. Springfield has not committed to social housing, keeping

extended families in the village or any other form of public benefit. An example of this that can already be seen in Ardersier is that Springfield's commitments about zebra crossings for the kids from their existing McPherson Drive development have come to nothing. The proposed developer (who may (or may not) have a contract on the Getti/ Beattie fields has lost an asbestos-related case in November due to their malpractice) - [Martin McGowan v Springfield Properties Plc] Given how they have behaved during the development of 107 houses already in Ardersier, there are no grounds to trust this organisation to respect the law, health and well-being of the community of Ardersier. Except below from the court papers: Relations between the parties soured when the pursuer began raising health and safety concerns with the defender, notably around the presence of asbestos on certain of their sites. He did this by way of direct communication, letter, email and text over a period of some months. He asserted, put very shortly, that the defender had known about the presence of asbestos, had done nothing about it, and had allowed men, including the pursuer's teams, to work on sites contaminated with asbestos. No suitable PPE for working in the presence of asbestos was provided to those working on the sites. Matters came to a head when the pursuer emailed the defender on 1 February 2016 repeating these concerns. Concerns were raised separately by certain of the pursuer's employees with the health and Safety Executive, who began an investigation. The defender raised McGowan v Springfield Properties Plc, 2025 WL 02446912 (2025) © 2026 Thomson Reuters. 2 proceedings for interdict and interim interdict founding on the allegations made by the pursuer, which they asserted were untrue and defamatory. Interim interdict was pronounced on an ex parte basis on 5 February 2016.

4. In around October 2020, the defender was prosecuted and pled guilty to certain Health and Safety offences relating to the presence of asbestos on certain of their sites. They received a fine in respect of those offences. Shortly thereafter the pursuer lodged with the court in the action for Interdict a number of documents he asserted demonstrated that the sting of the allegations that he had made were true. In May 2021, some 5 years after the interim interdict had been pronounced, it was recalled of consent and a joint minute entered into in terms of which the pursuer was granted decree of absolvitor in his favour. The proposed development site is a prime agricultural site. Less than two miles away there is a massive brownfield site in Haventus port of Ardersier where 2000 houses have been approved. Within the THC committee papers dated November 2025, the Empty Homes strategy document lists significant numbers of houses which are available, if tax policy and political will exist. MingYang, the proposed purchaser of the Port intend to use external labour for offshore wind generation. (assuming they get UK gov approval) The argument in favour of this development that relies on a demand for housing near the Haventus port is not viable for the reasons stated above. Ardersier has ~ 1100 residents in the available census - an addition of 600 houses will double the size of the village. Springfield (the nominated developer) has already built 107 houses. The residents of the Springfield development in Ardersier complain of low quality of building and extensive snagging issues. They were also promised a zebra crossing to allow kids to cross to the school area - Springfield does pretty brochures, poor build quality and broken promises. This is not a company that cares about people or the housing crisis; they are interested in profit maximisation. Ardersier has ~ 1100 residents in the available census - an addition of 600 houses will double the size of the village. Springfield (the nominated developer) has already built 107 houses. The residents of the Springfield development in Ardersier complain of low quality of building and extensive snagging issues. They were also promised a zebra crossing to allow kids to cross to the school area - Springfield does pretty brochures, poor build quality and broken promises. This is not a company that cares about people or the housing crisis; they are interested in profit maximisation. The radar systems in the Airport will be affected by buildings placed on the ridge behind Station

Road, which faces the airport. This is a serious issue for infrastructure, and the community have a right to know how you intend to justify/address this. A picture dated ~ 1933 shows a landslip near Fulmar Crescent - the rising springs on the Fulmar Crescent road. The developer intends to shut the road between Fulmar Crescent and the Mains of Ardersier farm - this will divert the water flows in the substrate underneath the site and endanger the existing buildings in Ardersier. Again, the MCA allows the developer to ignore issues and circumvent existing planning controls. This is a major issue for the community of Ardersier. Please explain how you can justify this clearly, poorly thought out infrastructure issue. Boundary walls built in the 1700s delimiting the fort border the proposed site; these will be destroyed by the developer as they have not yet been classified as a scheduled monument. Local history needs to be respected and preserved, and the current plans show that profit is being prioritised at the expense of people. As a resident of Ardersier, I have photographed bats, badgers and pine martens in the proposed development area near the water tower. The MCA proposal allows the developer to circumvent comprehensive environmental assessments. Many endangered and rare species call this area home, and the proposed plans flagrantly disregard animal welfare and preservation laws and legislation. Ecology - bats The proposed site is close to the SSSI and bats which feed on the updraft rising up the cliff. The proposed site will disturb the bats feeding on the insects being blown up the sandy brae from the village. Bats are protected under environmental law; this project irresponsibly disregards the ramifications it will have on wildlife. Infrastructure The health centre in Ardersier does not have the capacity to cope with a doubling in size - if 600 houses are built, the health provision will not be able to cope. Of the 6 consultation rooms, two are upstairs, which means that only four rooms are currently accessible to disabled patients. It is irresponsible and disregards the welfare of residents and future residents of Ardersier to allow this site to go ahead until the infrastructure is in place. This site will result in local GP services being even more overwhelmed than they already are. Kindly explain how you intend to protect and support the medical facilities and health of patients in Ardersier? Infrastructure The schools in the local area do not have the capacity to accommodate the exponential population increase that will happen with the new 600 proposed houses. The planners are convinced that they can push the class sizes to 35, which is disputed by the teachers who actually work there. The teachers in the school disagree and argue that the funding is not in place to expand the school. This will have a detrimental effect on educational outcomes for local children and completely disregards the effect poor infrastructural planning has on the community. Infrastructure The road access is inadequate for the size of the development. The Gollanfield road has a weight restriction on the railway bridge. The 'Nairn road' between Ardersier and Nairn is narrow and cannot cope with the bus traffic at the moment - HGVs will cause further deterioration of the surface. The Ardersier / Airport road will require HGVs to travel up the Nairn road within Ardersier, blocking pedestrian traffic as well as kids walking to and from school. (There is already an increased risk for these children as the last Springfield property development neglected to put zebra crossings in place, even after community complaints.) That's the construction phase - if the population of Ardersier doubles, then the existing inadequate roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. We know that the council have no budget and no monies to work on anything other than the Inches roundabout and chips and tar for all the potholes. These plans will majorly impact the roads, and there is zero - zero - consideration for how this is going to affect people. To allow this project to go ahead is negligence. The infrastructure is not in place. Can you please reply and let the community know how you intend to deal with these issues? I have just sent you a number of emails, each explaining the reasons why I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. I split them up so it is easier for you to respond to each issue individually. These are all issues that are widely discussed within the community of Ardersier, and the resounding opinion is that this project is proposed in the name of extracting wealth from a small community, already dealing with infrastructure issues, poor

educational and health outcomes. The community feels completely disregarded throughout this planning stage, and is very much looking for you to adequately respond to their legitimate concerns. If you could please take the time to respond to my emails and address the concerns listed, this is the bare minimum for a project that is going to have enormous ramifications for the lives and well-being of the residents of Ardersier.

Submission number

S-56-1

Consultee number

1401131

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

Ardersier is a small rural and historic Conservation Village with a tight knit community who place great value on their cultural identity as a rural and farming community. This disproportionate, insensitive and legally risky Masterplan Consent Area development is objected to for a number of reasons. Ardersier is a very small village with minor B roads as access/egress to the main A96 road (which has not yet been duelled despite promises from Scottish Government) and with single track roads with passing places connecting the B roads. None of these B roads have footpaths for safe pedestrian travel, nor are there cycle paths. There are working farms and prime agricultural land on the green belt area completely surrounding Ardersier and valuable woodland which is teeming with wildlife. Ardersier is steeped in military history due to its location alongside Fort George. There are a number of monuments protected by law and Ardersier is completely surrounded by areas of natural beauty which are home to animals which are also protected by law. Cromal Mount is a significant medieval site which is a scheduled monument protected by The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The proposed MCA runs alongside this important historical site. There is a well known badgers set along Cromal Hill (adjoining the proposed MCA site) and it is very common to observe the animals whilst out walking in the farmlands above the village. Badgers are protected by The Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Badgers setts are also protected under The Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011. There are bat roosts in many of the farm buildings around the proposed Masterplan Consent Area. In Scotland, all species of bats and their roosts are legally protected under The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 and NatureScot is the Governing body responsible for issuing protected species licences when any development or action is proposed which may affect bats or their roosts. Surveys require to be carried out by professional Ecologists to establish impact. In addition, the area above the proposed Masterplan Consent Area in Ardersier is a hunting ground for protected birds of prey who are also protected by The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Watching these majestic birds is a privilege and one which must be protected. A Masterplan Consent Area is entirely the wrong mechanism to suggest utilising for any development in such an area, and a Full Planning Application is what Highland Council need to be proposing to consider any development whatsoever in this

important historic Conservation area. The proposal of an MCA in Ardersier would result in established planning safeguards being removed and this is in direct contravention to the principles of Scotland's current plan-led planning system. This objection does not oppose development in principle but opposes the appropriateness of the MCA mechanism for this disproportionately large and legally risky plan on this particular site. Ardersier is a Conservation village and the proposed Masterplan Consent Area site for Ardersier is sitting on the adjoining border of the Conservation line designated by The Highland Council in May 1996. The purpose of Conservation status is to ensure that Ardersier's areas character and appearance is preserved, protected and enhanced. The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 places statutory duties on Local Authorities, namely The Highland Council, to ensure a much higher degree of scrutiny when considering any and all building within or surrounding Conservation areas. How then can a faster, and more streamlined approach to planning (avoiding much of the scrutiny which is considered and offered in a Full Planning Application) such as an MCA even be a consideration by The Highland Council when considering risks and impact on this historic Conservation area of a disproportionately large development. It is entirely inappropriate to even consider using the MCA process. The National Planning Policy framework in Scotland states that brownfield sites should be the preferred development sites for Local Authorities, sites which already have good access/egress and accessible infrastructure shops/schools/GP surgery. There are more appropriate sites closer to the A96 and Inverness/Nairn (where infrastructure is already in place to absorb potentially over 2000 people) rather than profit driven developers choosing to destroy green belts, prime farmland, natural habitats and Conservation areas. Ardersier has no infrastructure in place to support a disproportionate development of this size and scale. Presently, there are approximately 1350 people living within this small rural and historic Conservation community with working farms and prime agricultural land all around us. It is a small tight knit community and we greatly value our rural, peaceful way of life. A development of 600 houses would have a catastrophic impact on the rural village way of life, it would turn us into a town and without any infrastructure whatsoever to support this huge change. Many people specifically live here for the peace and tranquillity of living around wildlife and woodlands and in small communities. Public Transport links to and from Inverness and Nairn from Ardersier are already woefully inadequate and buses are subject to regular and ongoing changes meaning they remain completely unreliable and have been for years. There has been a new train station built next to the airport, however the roads which people would require to travel on to access this train station are B roads which already experience regular road traffic accidents and there have been a number of deaths on these roads. There has recently been traffic calming measures implemented on the B9039 following road deaths. These small roads barely cope with the traffic they currently experience, never mind adding another 600 houses with the possibility of around 1000 more vehicles requiring access/egress and requiring to commute to places of work. This would be unsafe and would cost more lives. The area where this Masterplan Consent Area is being considered, is prime agricultural land with several working farms, livestock living there, and crops being farmed on the land. We are living in times where we need to produce more fresh food and farming communities and green belt areas are crucial areas to protect and preserve for future generations, not to destroy in the pursuit of profit with minimal scrutiny of plans. Farmers and their way of life are protected by The Agriculture and Rural Communities (Scotland) Act 2024. The surrounding area has already lost huge areas of farming and agricultural land with the enormous development of land creating thousands of houses at Tornagrain, Nairn, Croy and Smithton. Many of these developments are unfinished to be able to actually assess and establish what housing need still remains. It is not necessary to continue developing on valuable green belt and

farming/agricultural land and destroying Conservation areas and farming communities. Highland Council should be following the National Planning Policy framework of building on brownfield sites, where infrastructure is already in place, or at least is more accessible than at Ardersier. The MCA process feels too rushed and with insufficient time, and insufficient crucial information for the community to be properly involved in something which will massively affect their way of life. A Full Planning Application process would also enable the local Community Council to be involved on a Statutory basis, which an MCA process prevents. The 3 access and egress routes into/out of this MCA site to the A96 (B9039, B9006, B9092) are all very small, narrow B roads which are already shared with farming vehicles and machinery. Its not unusual to have to pull completely off the road to allow for large farming vehicles to pass. To potentially add another 1000 cars commuting in and out of this small peninsula area is at best ludicrous, and at worst highly dangerous. The main commuting route into and out of the village to Inverness and passing the airport (B9039) has already been subject to traffic calming measures, has very regular road traffic accidents and very sadly, several accidents have resulted in deaths on this road. The other 2 routes (B9006 & B9092) are insufficiently wide enough in points to allow two vehicles to pass safely and there are unending farm vehicles using these roads as they go about their business of tending to the land and animals. An MCA process is completely inappropriate to utilise in a green belt area where full transparent assessments of roads are not available for members of the community to scrutinise. The proposed Masterplan Consent Area is an area adjoining Ardersier on an elevated position directly on top of this Conservation village. Local Authorities have specific Duties and Responsibilities when considering any planning around Conservation areas.

Conservation areas are legally protected by The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. Ardersier local knowledge is being disregarded, as was demonstrated in the meeting in Ardersier with Highland Council and Springfield Developers on 14 January. Local people are aware of and expressed concerns about our knowledge of a huge number of streams and wells and a historic reservoir in this proposed elevated MCA area, all of which can be viewed on the Highland Historic Environment Record. Historically, the properties which run along the base of this hill (a hill which you propose to build upon) relied upon the local springs and wells to source their water. In 1902, the Queen Victoria drinking fountain was erected in the village square as a Chalybeate Well, to celebrate Queen Victoria's reign, and it still stands there today, protected by Historic Scotland on their statutory list as an important Historical Memorial in our Conservation village. The Queen Victoria fountain was served by the natural reservoir directly on top of Cromal Hill in the farmland you propose to build on (reservoir visible clearly via National Library of Scotland mapping). When considering a development on an elevated position, with houses directly underneath it, and on land where there are known to be natural reservoirs, springs and wells, then surely the Local Authority has a Duty to ensure full drainage investigations and assessments are carried out and that these are available for the community affected to scrutinise? It is critical for any new development to undertake a number of specific assessments and to be transparent with the community which may be impacted. It is also crucial for any new development to offer Site Specific Evidence (providing calculations and water management plans) and to include and gain consents from the Statutory body SEPA. Drainage Impact Assessments (DIA's), Flood Risk Assessment (FRA's) and Surface Water Drainage Assessments (Sud's) are all necessary when considering the legislation Local Authorities require to adhere to. The Flood Protection (Scotland) Act 1961 & The Flood Prevention & Land Drainage (Scotland) Act 1997 places a Duty on the Local Authority, namely The Highland Council, who require to publish this crucial information in the

planning phases. Any assessments undertaken must be provided by companies and organisations with no affiliation to Local Authority or to Developers, so as to ensure that advice is independent and not biased. An MCA process means that the local community, who may be directly impacted, will not have the opportunity to establish the risks associated with a large development above and alongside them. The residents living all along the High Street and Fulmar Crescent have Common Law rights, and these rights seem to be getting overlooked in the MCA process. A Full Planning Application process would be a more transparent and appropriate process to consider this and allow residents of this village to make informed decisions, it would also allow the Community Council to act in a Statutory capacity, which they cannot do with an MCA.

When considering this Masterplan Consent Area proposal, it is important to consider the Developers who Highland Council are proposing to carry out the building of the properties on the site, particularly on a site in a Conservation village where stringent measures are enforced by Local Authorities to ensure integrity, preservation and protection should be of the utmost importance. The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour when considering establishing an evidence base to assess future Risk. The Springfields Developer Properties Group are a company who have demonstrated on a number of occasions that they do not act with integrity and in fact have acted criminally. A developer who behaves with such a lack of integrity, and who demonstrates criminal behaviour should not be involved in any future development, and definitely not one which will potentially completely destroy a small rural Conservation community and destroy swathes of natural habitat and farmland around it. Springfields Developers were fined by the Health Service Executive (Case number 44745117) for breaching Health and Safety laws for the environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation]. Springfields boast of selling high quality homes, yet court documents highlighted their concealment of dangerous and deadly substances which they then used as backfill [redacted – unsubstantiated allegations] There is a class lawsuit being pursued by the contractors involved in handling the deadly waste which remains ongoing in January 2026. There has already been a Springfields development in the village of Ardersier launched in 2020, albeit a much smaller one than proposed at the MCA site. As a village, we are still integrating all the new families and people into our community. This new development is not without problems and many of the people living there in the high quality homes" Springfields claim to have built are reporting living in substandard quality homes and are experiencing unending issues with plumbing/drainage/internal and external mould/gardens flooding and who are getting absolutely no assistance from Springfields as soon as the ink was dry on their purchase agreements (despite Springfields After Sales promises). Another example of substandard building came from a lady living in one of the Springfields homes in Ardersier who had a Solar Panel assessment carried out on her home with a view to having Solar Panels installed. She was advised that the trusses Springfields had used in her roof were not sufficiently strong enough to hold Solar Panels so yet again this highlights the poor build quality from Springfields. Costcutting and profit are clearly more important to Springfields than anything else. In terms of Infrastructure to support the MCA we will no doubt hear about numerous promises made by Springfields as they look to push this profit driven development forward. It is over 5 years on from Springfields first development of houses in Ardersier and the infrastructure they promised to provide to ensure children can safely get to school via a Pelican Crossing linking their development to the rest of the village has not been built. This means children are risking their lives each day trying to cross a busy road to reach their school (a road which would be considerably busier should the MCA go ahead with the potential for an

additional 1000 cars travelling in and out the village). I will say once again the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour and we have thus far evidenced nothing but a lack of integrity a lack of help and a lack of interest in supporting infrastructure from Springfields [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation]. Does the Highland Council offer any assurances that dealing with Springfields during an MCA development will be any different for our community? This development is disproportionately large and should not be approved by Highland Council planning. Highland Council should be severing ties with a developer [rephrased – unsubstantiated allegation] with Springfield's track record and should be seeking to use the streamlined MCA process on established brownfield sites with infrastructure already in place certainly not at historic rural Conservation areas like Ardersier. "

Submission number

S-55-1

Consultee number

1401120

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

I oppose the MCA in Ardersier for the following reason: Environmental The 'ardersier boards'pdf available on the highland council website show pipes running through and next to Cromal mount site. This company will destroy and degrade the late medieval fortification. Public Opinion. The MCA process has not been done in scotland before (as far as I can tell) it's clear that THC are unfamiliar with the process and the developer is using this to rush through a doubling of the size of ardersier without due process. Public Opinion Community wealth building law (2026) - this development extracts wealth from ardersier and enriches Springfield shareholders and property speculators. I believe that it runs directly counter to the law that's just been passed in Holyrood and extracts wealth from the many and enriches the few. Springfield have not committed to social housing, keeping extended families in the village or any other form of public benefit. Springfields commitments about zebra crossings for the kids from their existing McPherson drive development have come to nothing. The proposed developer (who may (or may not) have contract on the Getti/ Beattie fields have lost an asbestos case in November) - [Martin McGowan v Springfield Properties Plc] Given how they have behaved during the development of 107 houses already in Ardersier there are no grounds to trust this organisation in any way. Except below from the court papers: Relations between the parties soured when the pursuer began raising health and safety concerns with the defender notably around the presence of asbestos on certain of their sites. He did this by way of direct communication letter email and text over a period of some months. He asserted put very shortly that the defender had known about the presence of asbestos had done nothing about it and had allowed men including the pursuer's teams to work on sites contaminated with asbestos. No suitable PPE for working in the presence of asbestos was provided to those working on the sites. Matters came to a head when the pursuer emailed the defender on 1 February 2016 repeating these concerns. Concerns were raised separately by certain of the pursuer's employees with the

health and Safety Executive who began an investigation. The defender raised McGowan v Springfield Properties Plc 2025 WL 02446912 (2025) © 2026 Thomson Reuters. 2 proceedings for interdict and interim interdict founding on the allegations made by the pursuer which they asserted were untrue and defamatory. Interim interdict was pronounced on an ex parte basis on 5 February 2016. 4. In around October 2020 the defender was prosecuted and pled guilty to certain Health and Safety offences relating to the presence of asbestos on certain of their sites. They received a fine in respect of those offences. Shortly thereafter the pursuer lodged with the court in the action for Interdict a number of documents he asserted demonstrated that the sting of the allegations that he had made were true. In May 2021 some 5 years after the interim interdict had been pronounced it was recalled of consent and a joint minute entered into in terms of which the pursuer was granted decree of absolvitor in his favour' The proposed development site is a prime agricultural site. Less than two miles away there is a massive brownfield site in Haventus port of Ardersier where 2000 houses have been approved. Within the THC committee papers dated Nov 2025 Empty Homes strategy the document lists significant numbers of houses which are available if tax policy and political will exists. MingYang the proposed purchaser of the Port intend to use external labour for off-shore wind generation. (assuming they get UK gov approval) Ardersier has ~ 1100 residents in the available census - an addition of 600 houses will double the size of the village. Springfield (the nominated developer) has already built 107 houses. The residents of the springfield house residents complain of low quality and extensive snagging issues. They were also promised a zebra crossing to allow kids to cross to the school area - Springfield does pretty brochures poor build quality and broken promises. The radar systems in the Airport will be affected by buildings placed on the ridge behind station road which faces the airport. Environmental A picture dated ~ 1933 shows a landslip near fulmar crescent - the rising springs on the fulmar crescent road. The developer intends to shut the road between Fulmar crescent and the Mains of Ardersier farm - this will divert the water flows in the substrate underneath the site and endanger the existing buildings in ardersier. Again the MCA allows the developer to ignore issues and circumvent existing planning controls. Environmental There are 4 springs listed on the existing maps however the older maps list 11 springs rising through the geology of that site. Given the elevation of the site the probability of flooding of the old village is significant.

Boundary walls built in the 1700 delimiting the fort border the proposed site these will be destroyed by the developer as they have not yet been classified as a scheduled monument. The proposed site is close to the scheduled monument of Comal mount and it's surrounding fortifications. Ecology As a resident of Ardersier I have photographed bats badgers and pine martens in the proposed development area near the water tower. The MCA proposal allows the developer to circumvent comprehensive environmental assessments. Ecology - bats The proposed site is close to the SSSI and bats which feed on the updraft rising up the cliff. The proposed site will disturb the bats feeding on the insects being blown up the sandy brae from the village. Infrastructure The health centre in ardersier does not have the capacity to cope with a doubling in size - if 600 house are built the health provision will not be able to cope. Of the 6 consultation rooms 2 are upstairs preventing most invalids getting up the stairs. Infrastructure The state of the schools do not have the capacity to double in size - as will happen with the new 600 proposed houses. The planners are convinced that they can push the class sizes to 35 and there will be room. The teachers in the school disagree and argue that the funding is not in place to expand the school.

Infrastructure 1 The road access is inadequate for the size of the development. The Gollanfield

road has a weight restriction on the railway bridge. The 'nairn road' between ardersier and Nairn s narrow and cannot cope with the bus traffic at the moment - HGVs will cause further deterioration of the surface. The Ardersier / Airport road will require HGV to travel up the nairn road within Ardersier blocking pedestrian traffic as well as kids walking to and from school. That's the construction phase - if the population of Ardersier doubles then the existing inadequate roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. We know that the council have no budget and no monies to work on anything other than the insches roundabout - and chips and tar for all the potholes. Environmental Crofts I0056 and I0069 form part of the proposed area. They have not been decrofted and have not gone through due process. Environmental The area around the old station has been listed as 'contaminated' land due to the dumping of waste material from the train engines - Springfield has not listed any way to deal with this pollution in their application. "

Submission number

S-54-1

Consultee number

1401119

Date

12/02/2026

Comments

I think the proposal is disproportionate to the size of the village. By my estimate it will almost double the side of the village in area and population. It will change the character of what is a rural community. A development of this size should be orientated towards large conurbations. It is not clear from the literature why Ardersier has specifically been chosen as a site for a MCA? I also have a wider concern with reference to the 'urbanisation' of rural communities in the Highlands and its long term impact on the likes of tourism which is a key economic driver. I'm concerned that in reference to medical provision it outlines the problem of the current capacity to deal with the population increase but does articulate a proposed solution. The speed of broadband is already slow. The proposal will increase in broadband demand. I would wish to see as part of the planning proposal and increase in prioritisation for the provision of fibre broadband to the whole village. My property is adjacent to the development and I would like the opportunity to discuss what the boundary between my property and the development looks like. The development will increase the traffic in the local area. I am concerned about access onto the A96 towards Inverness without the A96 upgrade.

Submission number

S-53-1

Consultee number

1401098

Date

11/02/2026

Comments

As a resident of Ardersier I have concerns about the MCA proposal to build up to 600 homes on farmland at the east end of the village. While there are concerns about the required infrastructure for such a development and the social impact of doubling the size of the village, my worry is about the process and why only one developer is involved. Springfield have already build on the south side of the village with dissatisfaction from the folks who have to contend with damp in their homes and being beholden to the developer for ground maintenance etc. So, for the same company to be involved in the latest proposals is worrying. Has THC considered opening this project to other house builders, especially those local firms being elbowed out by larger enterprises? I do hope that THC are not using the MCA approach to pay lip service to a "done deal."

Submission number

S-52-1

Consultee number

1401097

Date

11/02/2026

Comments

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Masterplan Consent Area (MCA) at Ardersier Mains, as outlined in the recent public consultation notice. While I understand the need for sustainable development, I have serious concerns about the scale, impact, and suitability of this proposal in its current form:

- Infrastructure Capacity** – The local road network, public transport provision, and utility services are already under strain. Adding up to 600 new homes without confirmed, funded upgrades risks significant congestion, safety issues, and service disruption.
- Environmental Impact** – The proposed development area includes sensitive habitats and green spaces that are important for biodiversity and community wellbeing. Large-scale construction could cause irreversible damage to local wildlife and the coastal environment.
- Community Character** – Ardersier is a small, close-knit village with a distinct identity. A development of this size risks overwhelming the existing community, altering its character, and reducing quality of life for current residents. This development would turn a small village into a small town. We have already had 117 houses added by the proposed developer which is causing a strain on the infrastructure.
- Education** - This area has been included as a potential MCA as the primary and secondary school are not at capacity, another 40 pupils will make the primary school over capacity at the moment children starting nursery have no place and are having to drive 10 miles to Nairn, Culloden Academy is 400 pupils over capacity as they are being taught in temporary classrooms which disguises the extent the school is over crowded, the school has not got the capacity in the social areas for the expected rise in school roll published by the Highland Council, Planning was already in place to build a new school but has now been pulled by the Scottish Government. The school should have been finished in 2026 not still in planning. Please note also the developments at Balloch, Stratton and Tornagraim feed into this school. The hospitals, Doctors and Dentists in this area are severely overloaded; another development of 600 houses will just exacerbate the matter even further. Profit before people. Lack of Detailed Mitigation

Plans – The consultation materials do not provide sufficient detail on how the above issues will be addressed, nor on how the development will be phased to minimise disruption I urge the Council and Scottish government to reconsider the scale and approach of this proposal, and to explore other areas that can meet its needs.

Submission number

S-51-1

Consultee number

1401096

Date

11/02/2026

Comments

In regard to the MCA planned for Ardersier I have a number of points that need to be clarified, 1 There is a considerable confusion in the community regarding the concept of an MCA and why Ardersier is going to be the first application to be built under MCA rules, I feel this needs clarified, How and when any objections can be made, a number of people are under the impression the current rules of engagement with full planning will still apply, My points from, the MCA guidance 2 NO 28. MCAs offer potential to provide a holistic streamlined approach to consenting, providing planning permission, plus roads construction consent, listed building consent, and conservation area consent – where provided for in the particular MCA scheme. It also offers the ability to set out the conditions of the various consents together. Ardersier is a conservation village I feel this should be discussed before the application is given approval. 3 NO 30. MCAs will be able to be used to prioritise investment in particular locations or to secure delivery of local priorities, outcomes and proposals in the local development plan (LDP). MCAs can make their areas more attractive to potential investors and developers by providing certainty and removing much of the risk. Who is going to liable for the costs of the investment that will be required in Ardersier? 4 NO 33. The land covered by an MCA scheme does not need to be within the ownership of the local authority. MCAs can be used as part of collaborative working between the planning authority, landowners, developers and investors, key agencies and the community. With the planning authority taking the lead, it can take account of local needs and aspirations, and work with developers to ensure what the scheme requires is feasible and deliverable. copied from MCA. Does this mean that the Highland Council will take responsibility if the residents of Ardersier needs and aspirations are not met?. 5 No 35

- The masterplan in the scheme can be specifically tailored to take account of designated assets or particular character areas which could be subject to conditions to protect and enhance their unique characteristics. The development spoils the area and no way enhances the unique character of the village. It is a conservation and historic site, A small coastal village turned into a small town. 6 This area has been included as a potential MCA as the primary and secondary school are not at capacity, another 40 pupils will make the primary school over capacity at the moment children starting nursery have no place and are having to drive 10 miles to Nairn,

Culloden Academy is 400 pupils over capacity as they are being taught in temporary classrooms which disguises the extent the school is over crowded, the school has not got the capacity in the social areas for the expected rise in school roll published by the Highland Council, Planning was already in place to build a new school but has now been pulled by the Scottish Government. The school should have been finished in 2026 not still in planning. Please note also the developments at Balloch, Stratton and Tornagrain feed into this school. A school should to be built before any more houses are be given the go ahead. 7 The proximity to Ardersier Port. At the moment there is not the immediate requirement of houses for any employees at the site. There are already house sites in planning and been built within 2 miles of the site, With better vehicle access roads to the site, The road from Ardersier to the site is practically single track for 4 miles and would need a considerable upgrade. 8 The infrastructure particularly the roads are not suitable for the approximately 800 cars coming in a out of the proposed MCA either to Inverness or Nairn, Another 800 cars feeding onto the A96, will the roads be upgraded to allow for extra traffic. This should also be planned before planning is authorised 9 The proximity to the airport and the height of the site must have an impact to the airport particularly the radar, This should been addressed before getting MCA status. 10 The hospitals, Doctors and Dentists in this area are severely overloaded another development of 600 houses will just exasperate the matter even further. Profit before people. I understand the need for housing but planning cannot be approved on this scale without the infrastructure being in place to accommodate the rise of approximately 1500 people to an already over populated area. I feel that the Highland Council and the Scottish Government have to address these issues before this is given the approval for being an MCA, I am writing to formally object to the proposed Masterplan Consent Area (MCA) at Ardersier Mains, as outlined in the recent public consultation notice. While I understand the need for sustainable development, I have serious concerns about the scale, impact, and suitability of this proposal in its current form: I attach a planning refusal notice of part of the now area marked for a MCA, I believe that this contravenes the criteria set out in the MCA guidelines. I am objecting to the proposed area as at the moment it is registered crofts, numbers I0056 and I0069 data from the Crofters Commission website. Objection is the use of good prime farmland or peatland. Please can you advise if the land as been decrofted and the Crofters commission been informed.

Submission number

S-50-1

Consultee number

1401000

Organisation

Ardersier and Petty Community Council

Date

11/02/2026

Comments

Ardersier and Petty Community Council Master Plan/Springfield Introduction The following are comments collected pre and post public consultation held on Wednesday 14th January 2026 from members of the community taken from various meetings, Facebook polls and comments, email, phone calls, workshop and face to face contact. Almost all of the community highlighted similar comments so these have been summarised to reflect overall comments. The main comment agreed by the community, Cllr Robertson and the Community Council members was that this should not be allowed to proceed any further due to it being the wrong model, in the wrong place and because of no confidence in the chosen developer.

Infrastructure Education Currently One HC ELC and one Day-care at Rosebuds Nursery. One primary Ardersier Primary School and Culloden Academy is the catchment high school. Some of the community access other educational facilities in Croy, Cawdor, Tornagrain and Nairn. Statistics provided at the public consultation meeting on 14th January 2026 were strongly challenged as those with working knowledge in the schools disagreed and stated schools were way over capacity and could no longer provide essential qualifications due to lack of investment and high capacity. These are continual comments that have been given to the APCC for almost a decade. It is well known that children are being forced to have educational classes outside due to the pressures of no classrooms or subjects. The community feels a new school should be added to the developer plans with the developer responsible for providing the school. This has been the case for other developments but has rarely been carried through.

Health care Primary care within this area have struggled for some considerable time. Dentist appointments are backlogged by several years and are unable to cope with regular visits with some patients having waited over five years for appointments. Our current GP surgery is not working to capacity and is often empty with appointments still only part time. The services have depleted considerably over the last decade.

Connectivity Pathways need upgraded and created as there is still no safe route between the village and Connage Dairy to provide safe route to school. There is no crossing still from Springfield to the Primary School/Nursery. There is still no path along the right hand side of the Springfield estate therefore again no safe crossings to the Primary school/nursery. Road access in and out of the village is pressured with roads which were essentially farm routes with little or no possibility of them being widened or strengthened to provide essential or safe access to the village. This includes access to the MCA site which intends to close essential access for residents and farms within that area. It will additionally leave no access from the Church to the Cemetery. A96 and gaining access to this within current constraints is difficult and unsafe. With duelling work being considered for the next decade this again will put elevated pressure onto the village as people will use it to avoid road works and gain access to A96 further along. The roads within the village are unstable and often sink and erode due to the increase in flooding. Cycle lanes are absent from the village outwards. Anyone travelling into Inverness using this mode of transport are heavily at risk from being injured. It is impossible to go from Arderiser to the airport without incident.

Chosen Developer The community as a whole have stated they have no confidence in the chosen developer Springfield. This is down to personal experience with the scheme they have just completed. None of the mitigations discussed within the consultation and CLG for the finished development have been carried out. Almost all of the 107 completed units have ongoing maintenance issues that are more significant than snagging issues. Residents of this part of the village state that communications are lacking, that they are not taken seriously and issues are not dealt with in a timely fashion, if at all. Parks, crossings and various other mitigations were discussed before building commenced and were not delivered. During construction, noise, light and dust pollution were issues raised and ignored. The community feels that there is no confidence in the developer to participate effectively or manage issues raised effectively. Highland Council

Planning Consultation These were not effectively communicated. Content was changed and not communicated. Community feels pushed into making a decision about this without any relevant information being given. No plans were available. Springfield could not confirm they owned the land and were unprofessional. Statistics and information given around these were not accurate and did not give a proper projected outlook. Community felt they were told it was happening no matter what they say or decide. The community felt they were expected to make a quick decision without any information available so therefore could not make an informed decision or have an informed discussion. This process appears flawed from the beginning.

Facebook Polls Community was asked which infrastructure was important to them and Education and Health Care came out highest with 25% of answers stating all of the elements were important. Roads and connectivity were important to the community as many pathways and roads need created or improved for daily living and that an added large scheme of housing would put added to extreme pressure onto the current network and therefore all would need to be upgraded or improved. Over several public meetings held by The Action Group and workshop held by The Community Council, the following are a collection of all the comments submitted. 14th January 2026 Highland Council Public Consultation for MCA No

Comment 1 How would development effect house prices and insurance.  
 2 Can we stop this development? 3 Would sand bank effect development? 4 Are there protected species survey's ? 5 Offset development and how would it affect the habitat? 6 What mitigation is in place for protected species? 7

What is the housing model? Why is it not social housing? 8 Where is the traffic management plan? 9 How will the roads be improved? 10 What will during construction be like and after? 11 Who owns the land? 12 Are you (Springfield) going to finish Connage development like you promised? 13 From Scottish Water point of things how will this affect the site and village? 14 Aesthetics – Can the development go further back so cannot be seen from the High Street? Will it fit into the rest of the village or more of the same of current unfinished development? 15 Do you know that there is subsidence with the sandy bank? 16 There are badgers and various birds of prey using those fields? 17

Farm safety and access will be an issue what will be done about that? 18 At a time of food insecurity why would you build on prime agricultural land? 19 Flooding has escalated in recent years and the natural springs move within that area. How will you combat this? What flooding defences will be put in for High Street and corner beside Half a Moon? 20 Is there to be a drainage impact assessment? 21 The military road is not able to cope with construction traffic and has a weight restriction. What will then be the chosen road for construction? 22 Infrastructure all currently at capacity so what improvements will there be? 23 What heating will be used? 24 A96 access is currently under pressure. How will that look with 600 houses added to the village? 25 Will a rural impact assessment be carried out? 26 Previous development was refused determination due to contamination on site? How will this development now be determined due to the levels of Radon? 27th January 2026 Action Group Issues raised No Comment 1

The raised beach has historic slippage. 2 No confidence in developer – Springfield due to unfinished housing at Connage and that the company has been fined several times over environmental issues. Concern due to level of contaminants within current plan. 3 Flooding a major concern due to escalation of flooding due to climate change and the natural springs

within the embankment flooding roads and properties along High Street. 4 Proposed closing of Fulmar Crescent effectively cuts off emergency services, farm access and connections to village amenities and infrastructure. 5 No confidence in developer telling the truth as felt hiding information. 6 Concerns raised that there have been no plans about development and community being asked to make decisions on no information. Many felt the process was biased to the developer and have no say and would not have any chance to discuss with each other as process feels pushed and that community input does not matter. 7 Community would like Airport to be involved in the process as many felt that the height of this development would cause issues for the airport and potential flight pathways and radar. 8 Concerns over model of housing and that the prices will force more of their families out of Ardersier and that social housing should be first and foremost to enable families to live together. 9 All community present agreed wrong model, wrong place and no confidence in developer. 10 Natural springs produce water coming through tarmac in Fulmer Crescent and causing issues for properties right along the embankment. B9006 has had significant increase in flooding over recent years causing a business there to flood. Expectation is that will worsen with construction putting properties and businesses at risk. 11 Concerns over foundation disturbance from properties surrounding proposed development as foundations are not deep enough to withstand construction disturbance. 12 Concerns over lack of testing or surveys. 13 No acknowledgement from either the Council Planners or developer over SSSI,

heritage or proposed LNR and how this development will create disturbance and pollution to a conservation area. Heritage sites along from the development such as Cromal Mount and Queen Victoria Fountain may be disturbed or damaged by construction. 4th February 2026 APCC MCA workshop A workshop was held for all of the community to submit comments about feelings towards proposed MCA and asked to submit comments under several headings. Results are shown below. Ecology • Protected species such as badger, pine marten, red squirrel, bats all live within this area or use it to forage. •

Heritage site Cromal Mount would be effected by this development. • Current roads from village not fit for purpose now. They will not cope with more houses/people. •

Springfield and other big developers will always only try to do the minimum.

Particularly on topics such as ecology, geology, history, community. Profit before people. • Sewage where will it go? • There are a number of wells etc. around the village. • Increased pollution. Increased disturbance of wildlife. Increased possibility of

flooding. • Natural springs rise up at Hillhead and move downhill sometimes changing course. • The fields soak up water which is then flowing downhill to the sea via underground springs. Every house in the High Street had a well which indicates the amount of water in the hillside. We do not want these fields built on but if they are, we would want a huge green belt planted with trees to help with the water courses. • Environmental Impact Assessment needed where does this sit at in the MCA process? Geological survey? • How is the SSSI around the village affected? • Why do we need more housing when at moment in Highland there are 4900 empty houses? • Prime farmland should not be a site of choice when brownfield sites are available e.g. the old McDermott's site at Delnies and Port of Ardersier when it closes. We have lost enough farmland locally with housing and golf courses that

surround the village. • Flooding in the village, Station Drive, Fulmar Crescent and High Street. •  
 What is happening with the badgers in various setts in the fields? •

Where will the sewage pipes run? • It is an old sand dune and not suitable for building on it will cause shifting and cracking of buildings. Community • Too many new homes for a village this size. No infrastructure. • It is completely out of scale for any village. Current population is 1300 and this could double. • Building capacity – Springfield already build 100+ houses in Ardersier and sheer greed wanting to build more. • How are the historical sites around the village to be protected? • Roads are not fit for current traffic and also junction to A96 are already difficult for current traffic. • Development completely disproportioned to the size of the village and limited road infrastructure. •

Only 25% earmarked for social housing? Not enough/Community Wealth Bill. • We don't want this. We have chosen to live in a village which is also a conservation

area and value the place as it is. We are already surrounded by new developments that are not yet complete and don't need anymore – Hang fire HC! • School in the village won't be able to manage with extra students also where will secondary students go? • These houses will double the size of the village and impact on the community spirit/ethos. •

MCA has nothing to do with community – only about building more houses and developers making a profit. • Will any of these houses be allocated as HMO? Why is there a need for 5 bedroom houses? • How does this contribute to community wealth and development? Ardersier will end up as a dormitory town. • Why does Ardersier always get dumped on and never heard? Infrastructure • Ardersier is a conservation village and classified as Hinterland. • Roads are not suitable to accommodate extra traffic – bad enough as it is • Accessing A96 is already busy and dangerous. • Gollanfield Bridge has a weight restriction and not wide enough (B9006) • Some of the roads built on peat beds • Springfield have said they will remove a significant road at Fulmer Crescent. • Underground springs in fields – risk to flooding High Street. • Culloden Academy over capacity. Original capacity at 960 now with PortaKabins capacity is 1331. Which is ok for education purposes in classrooms but is over capacity for recreation and PortaKabins located on recreational areas. At lunchtimes it is a fire hazard to have all pupils located in indoor recreational space. PortaKabins are a temporary solution not permanent.

• Inadequate access roads. • Doctors, dentists, hospital and buses all over subscribed already and how will they accommodate new residents? It is currently a 9 hour waiting time for ambulance to get into A&E. • Public transport already inadequate so more will use cars causing pollution. • Sink holes are within village boundaries. Is there any within proposed development? • Inaccurate information being cited about schools. •

Local school and nursery inadequate at present. • Concerned about the impact of building on land where there are underground springs. Flooding occurs there and water comes out the stairs landing onto pavement. Concerned about impact on land stability of building without specialised engineering and proper drainage. • How many times do we hear the Council don't have money? • There has been no new infrastructure visibly improved since the 100 new houses. • Infrastructure should stay with the developer and done in tandem. • Porto cabins at the school are not sustainable for long term. •

Children crossing Nairn Road. • Stretched social services are already not coping. • Not enough thought to road structure and closing road to Fulmer Crescent will close road to Cemetery. Developer • Springfield as a company are demonstrating profits before people. With their lack of ongoing responsibility for previous housing estates. They blame the sub-contractors and yet are responsible for them. Their development companies should be held to account. • Failed promises of infrastructure in previous development. Pelican crossing – unsafe decisions for children. • Lack of integrity. HSE fines for health and safety breaches, dumping asbestos and carcinogens. Intimidating people who speak out – interdict order – McGowan case. • Development pots can be used in unrelated areas to the development. They do not work true to purpose. • Poor build quality. Trusses not strong enough in solar panel assessment, plumbing issues, mould internal/external drainage issues. • Convicted for asbestos dumping on building sites. •

Wasn't open about land ownership and a quick search on Highland Council LDP map shows Springfield already own the land. • Put a gagging order on a contractor that raised the issue about asbestos dumping. • Have heard they are already advertising in London. • Do not listen to local concerns, think they know better • Customers at Springfield Properties – snagging lists not dealt with. • Make false promises to local community regarding local benefit contributions – e.g. pelican crossing on Nairn road for school children to safely cross from houses behind Fettes Road to the school. • Lack of integrity/ • Too large a project/development. • No infrastructure in place to cope. •

Too big!! The village will lose its identity and integrity. Small slow development i.e. Key, quality before profit. • Seem shady. • I don't know why we can't facilitate smaller regulated sensitive village development. • Will there be independent surveys carried out re suitability of ground for construction? • Springfield director stated his company was by no means 'the worst' when asked at public consultation meeting. Said the insurance should give support for 4-year-old houses with infrastructure problems but that's too hard for most people to deal with. Additional comments • Community wealth building law – this proposed development will not reduce community wealth inequality as it will make developers and buy to rent owners wealthy and extract wealth from the community. Highland Council statutory responsibility to reduce inequality and poverty will be made worse/exacerbated by the development. This bill is in stage 3 and next stage is making it law. Is this why the Council is pushing for the MCA so quickly? • Concerned about the impact of such a large development on the village – would change the look and feel of our community. Larger towns might be able to absorb large developments but Ardersier can't. Would be a shame to lose the character of the village. Schools, can't cope with the needs of the village at present. What guarantees are there that the facilities needed for a large influx of people and families would there be? Culloden Academy has been needing replaced for years and years. • The following information was requested – How will the following be met Policy No Description  
 3 Positive effects for biodiversity and strengthening nature networks 13 Sustainable transport and active travel 14 Liveable connected spaces and the place principle. How will the MCA align with LDPs clear expectations for design, quality and space 15 Local living and 20min neighbourhoods allotments, green space, schools, shops 17 Development that is suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with character of the area 18 Infrastructure first 20 Blue green infrastructure 21 Play, recreation, sport 22 Flood risk and water management •

In 2018 Albyn Housing put in planning for 16 bungalows in contractor's yard and it was refused with Policy 28/29 as refusal. Conclusion In conclusion the community has made it very clear that the process of MCA is flawed. It is bringing an idea without information, which prevents any member of the community the ability to make an informed decision about what is proposed. The Planner informed the community at public consultation event that it did not matter how they felt about it that it was going ahead. The language used and information given was negative and not complete and resulted in a lot of community upset. The community have set up an Action Group to strongly give the community opinion that they think this is the wrong model, in the wrong place and have no confidence in the chosen developer. After five weeks of continual discussion and engagement with the community this is unlikely to change. This proposal should not progress any further for this site.

Submission number

S-49-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

11/02/2026

Comments

I have a number of initial comments at this very early stage. I appreciate this is a very new vehicle under consideration but it's very unclear the weight/power to be accorded each stakeholder at each of the stages. A serious commitment to full community involvement will require significantly more effort than the current desultory attempt. At this point I do not support the possible (or is it potential - these imply different things yet appear to be used interchangeably in your paperwork) MCA . The site is prime agricultural land on the outskirts of a small historically and environmentally important village and the proposal to built up to 600 houses would more than double the population of the village at one stroke. This is entirely unacceptable when community cohesion is so important. My other significant concern is around infrastructure, particularly roads - the current roads in and out of the village are entirely unsuitable and unsafe for 600 additional households let alone the traffic associated with such a large development.

Submission number

S-48-1

Consultee number

1400999

Date

11/02/2026

Comments

How can you approve houses to be built on prime agricultural land with no intension to upgrade the infrastructure of the village Ardersier has 511 homes at the moment and you intend to basically double it ,its not right and I object to this development I have objections to the planed housing at Ardersier its planned to be 600 homes on a sand dune with history of landslip and sink holes also lots of fresh water springs its a disaster waiting to happen and I object to this In light of radon gas being present in the proposed building site in the village surly this can't go ahead as this is a danger to life as it is the second leading cause of lung cancer how can the Highland council allow this to happen

Submission number

S-47-1

Consultee number

1400985

Date

10/02/2026

Comments

My concerns are that this is good Agricultural land which grow food crops , are people going to starve , ? because developers are building houses on every bit of good agricultural land that is around , it's shameful , they should not be allowed planning .

Submission number

S-46-1

Consultee number

1400983

Date

10/02/2026

Comments

I object to the Ardersier MCA on the grounds that it represents a premature, disproportionate and legally risky removal of established planning safeguards, contrary to the principles of Scotland's plan-led planning system. My objection does not oppose development in principle but changes the appropriateness of the MCA mechanism for this site. Are you sure that an MCA is the safest way forward ? This MCA assumes delivery of appropriate and required infrastructure... transport, health, utilities etc. There will be no commitment or leverage through the normal planning obligations. Chances are that our Government and Highland Council have to pick up the tabs for infrastructure after Springfield has finished with the profit making part. Do you fully agree with this ? Our own Councillors should be caring about the loss of decision making powers. They will have no leverage to change things and it is them that will ultimately get the blame anyway.

Ardersier MCA is setting a precedent that Councillors cannot change in the future. They will simply be spectators to the debacle. What are your reasons for this? I object to the Ardersier MCA on the grounds that it represents a premature, disproportionate and legally risky removal of established planning safeguards, contrary to the principles of Scotland's plan-led planning system. Have you an explanation as to why we should ditch a tried and tested formula? My objection does not oppose development in principle but asks if the MCA mechanism is appropriate for this site. This MCA permits development without normal planning safeguards. Is it correct that regardless the number of objections it cannot be refused or redesigned. Risk in all aspects will be borne by our Community not by Springfield. The MCA will grant advance consent for many years, even decades. Once it is approved our community will not be able to challenge anything. There will be nothing we can do regarding poor house designs and poor or non-existent infrastructure.

Submission number

S-45-1

Consultee number

1400966

Date

10/02/2026

Comments

I wish to object to the MCA proposal for Ardersier in principle as the concept of it is an ill-thought out, insensitive, quite ignorant and rushed process which does not take into account the likely impact on the local community and its environs. Ardersier has a strong, caring, interesting community with 22 different nationalities (when last I counted) gently integrated into the village alongside the native population. The potential influx of more new residents that this plan could bring to the village would likely be double, or more, the present population number. This would, I believe, be to the detriment of the village community. The environment matters.. but, importantly, so does the spirit, mental health, societal structure, and pace of life for the present residents. Modern life is stressful enough without those that are supposed to be taking care of our interests adding to it in this fashion. Your MCA process looks to be a back door money making scheme to ride roughshod over a precious conservation area and its inhabitants as fast as possible so that the majority will barely have had time to wake up to the real implications of it and what this will entail for community here. I object in principle to the plan for 600 new houses to be built in Ardersier. The Planning and Development Department within Highland Council has an obligation... Councils *must* produce Local Development Plans that consider the

*\*specific\** needs of rural areas supported by guidance on engaging communities in land use decisions. " Please advise me and provide guidance on where your in depth printed study of

*\*Ardersier's\** "specific needs" for as many as 600 new houses can be found and provide me with

copy. One would assume that your Local Development Plans are not just conjured up by creative imagination in some distant office. Surely they are backed by a real knowledge of and interaction with a community? You certainly have an obligation to do due diligence in this matter. I strongly object to your proposal to build up to 600 new houses in Ardersier on good agricultural land whether for arable or pasture at a time when it is importantly needed to secure and sustain our future generation/s In Highland all policies strategies are subject to an integrated screening for impact for children's rights and well-being climate change and mainland rural communities. I remind you that \*considering impacts\* is a core part of the decision-making process and members \*must\* give this due regard. This housing plan is guaranteed to impact the health and safety of our community. There would be risk increased for everyone but particularly for children in certain areas of the roadways eg Station Road and Nairn Road. For vehicles; which even now have increased with the new builds to the South of village and are seriously unfit to take the capacity that the MCA plan would incur on access routes to and from the A96. There is no doubt that there would be increased traffic also on the single track roads to the East of the village leading to the B9092 There would be less healthy direct access to the countryside proper we have so very many locals who walk/cycle/ride regularly in this area and visitors who are blown away by the beautiful village and surrounds. Ardersier and it's close-knit community must maintain its' Rural Status in line with it's history and ethos. It has coped with being developed to the South of the village in recent years but your proposal is a step to far in even considering the

\*option\* for utilizing an MCA here....a corporate political process akin to bringing a bomb to a ceileidh. (Of course you would know all this already if you had made a serious study of the area.) My proposal is that you seriously reflect on your "Duty of Care" commitment to our community. I oppose the plan to execute an MCA development at Ardersier with 600 new houses. I along with neighbors have serious concerns regarding the development and heavy ground work of land (whether SSSI or adjacent to SSSI) which may well interfere with and take flood or landslide risk with the historically recorded natural springs and their movement. There is evidence of around 11/12 wells behind High Street properties below the escarpment bordering the North field in your plan. I refer you to.. National Library of Scotland maps Inverness Shire (mainland) Sheet 1. Survey date 1870 Publication 1876

And.. in a survey of natural springs in Scotland... historically noted source of natural springs in the Ardersier area is a strongly chalybeate spring (mineral spring containing iron salts) located on the hill behind Campbelton (now part of Ardersier). Here are the details regarding natural springs and water sources in Ardersier based on historical and geographical accounts:  
Chalybeate Spring: Historical records (Statistical Accounts of Scotland) mention a spring often called a chalybeate or tonic that was famously frequented by invalids seeking health benefits.  
Shoreline Wells: Records of "healing wells" You state that detailed environmental and other assessments will be undertaken "if and when work on any MCA is authorized." Clarify please; is the MCA already authorized or not? In advance choosing Ardersier for an MCA proposal you (in your own words) judged the Health & Safety risks as having " no implications" Please provide me with the written report which led to that conclusion. "

Submission number  
S-44-1

Consultee number

N/A

Organisation  
Macleod Organics  
Date 10/02/2026

#### Comments

I wish to object to the concept of creating this Masterplan Consent area at Ardersier. In the initial information about M.C.A. s it is clearly stated that- 'The Masterplan Consent Area process allows a far more influential local Community input----- rather than reacting to a

developer proposal'. This proposal appears to be the opposite to that and is set to benefit the developer rather than the community. This developer (Springfield) does not have a good track record, especially with problems dealing with Asbestos. Doubling the size of the village without a proper full planning application being submitted is surely irresponsible and reckless. The impact of 600 houses will have a massive effect on the community in many ways and putting the future of the village into the hands of one developer is ,to me, clearly a risk not worth taking. Smaller scale normal planning applications with full considerations of the impact on the community such as schools, roads, health services, sewers, etc. must be the correct way forward. Not this MCA proposal which appears to only benefit the developer's profits.

Submission number  
S-43-1

Consultee number  
1400868

Date  
09/02/2026

#### Comments

I recognise that housing is needed for key workers in the Highlands, and this is a good opportunity to positively influence the new proposed model, so that existing and prospective residents alike benefit from a well-connected, healthy, well-serviced village. That said, I have the following comments and concerns, which I hope will be taken into consideration. NPF4 Policy 1: Significant weighting given to the global climate and nature crises The six guiding principles under Policy 1 aim to create sustainable places and this needs to be given due consideration in planning the area, especially in line with Policies 13, 14, 15 and 18 below. NPF4 Policy 3 (a, c and d) : Positive effects for biodiversity and strengthening nature networks Biodiversity loss is interconnected with climate change and this is a good opportunity to deliver for biodiversity. Ardersier has an active flora and fauna group consisting of enthusiastic volunteers and professional ecologists and environmental managers. Their local knowledge will be helpful in identifying key species and habitats in the area, but it is essential for the developer to engage a

professional ecologist at an early stage to carry out protected species and ornithological surveys at the appropriate time of year. Badgers are known to be prolific in the area and are likely to use ancient pathways through the fields in this location. Consideration of maintaining wildlife corridors must be made. NatureScot is developing their biodiversity enhancement metric currently (and CIEEM, my professional body, is heavily involved in advising NatureScot on this). There are other metrics (SSER) which are publicly available to ensure the development delivers for biodiversity. The Natural Environment Bill will receive Royal Assent next month, enacting the requirement for all new house builds to incorporate swift bricks. Advice must be taken from professional ecologists/ornithologists/specialists on how these are correctly sited. For example, bungalows would be too low in height for them to be effective. An allotment area would not only benefit the existing and prospective community, but provide excellent habitat for pollinators and connectivity for nature networks. NPF4 Policies 13, 14 and 15: Sustainable transport, placemaking and local living, 20- minute neighbourhoods Rather than this being just another large housing estate, there is an opportunity to make this an attractive place in line with the principles enshrined in NPF4's Policies 13, 14 and 15. The development should be a good opportunity to incorporate active travel modes such as cycle and walking paths. Inclusion of an allotment area would not only connect existing and new residents (providing well-being) but create good quality habitat for pollinators and a nature network for declining bird species such as the tree sparrow, which is recorded in the area.

There should be consideration to limit the number of properties that are bought for Air BnB or holiday homes; the reason the MCA is being proposed is to ensure there is housing available for key workers. They should be given priority. NPF4 Policy 17: Suitably scaled developments for new homes in rural areas The red line boundary indicates a doubling of the village footprint, leading to a change in the character of Ardersier. How does the MCA fit with NPF4 Policy 17? i.e. suitably scaled and in keeping with the character of the area, taking into account local living principles? This also links in directly with Policies 18 and 22 below and delivering sufficient public health services, transport needs, schools and facilities for residents, existing and new alike and importantly, managing flood risk and waste water.

NPF4 Policy 18 : Infrastructure first Infrastructure must be planned on an evidence basis as part of a well-designed development, and this needs to include public services such as shops, cafe, upgrade of roads, school, increased GP capacity, and good quality green space

i.e. allotments where existing and new residents can meet, connect and integrate into the village. The model at Tornagrain includes shop, cafe, allotments, active travel paths, tennis court and pharmacy, which aligns well with the 'placemaking' principle. There is still a lack of school. Evidence needs to be gathered on the capacity of existing public services in Ardersier and decisions made based on that evidence. This is a growing village which is feeling the strain on public services; there is a great opportunity to bolster the village's resilience in line with liveable places. NPF4 Policies 20 and 22: Blue-green infrastructure and flood risk and water management Well-designed blue-green infrastructure could provide multiple benefits to the community i.e. SUDS providing run-off attenuation, aquatic habitat for macro-invertebrates, oxygenating plants (no non-native species please!) pleasant amenity space etc. It can also take the strain off the public sewerage system. Getting the new and existing community involved in plans for upkeep of green infrastructure can instill a sense of pride and ownership, interest in nature and connectivity between residents. Waste water management is also a concern. Ardersier WWTW were upgraded to receive waste from Tornagrain and there are concerns that the footprint may

need to expand. There is currently a proposal to designate Ardersier Common as a Local Nature Reserve due to the presence of important species; coral root orchid, dingy skipper and small blue butterflies. If successful, this would (hopefully) restrict encroachment into the Common. There are the usual construction phase-related environmental impacts that will be a concern to residents, particularly traffic management, noise, dust, silt pollution of local watercourses. Appreciate we are not at that stage currently, and GI works will inform land structural integrity and drainage capacity before construction. I see this as a great opportunity to positively influence creation of a well-designed, connected place but the concern is that by streamlining the process, early engagement with key professionals will be missed in the rush to develop.

Submission number

S-42-1

Consultee number

1400867

Date

09/02/2026

Comments

600 new houses planned Ardersier. I strongly support the very many objections raised concerning the 600 new houses planned for Ardersier. Once again destroying valuable farmland. Why do we need 600 extra houses in our small village?;Is it to accommodate the predicted workforce that has been mentioned for the 'Port.:Is the \*Port" operational?? The additional traffic into and through Ardersier will only put more pressure and problems for the A96 which already has a poor record for traffic accidents. Planning at Highland Council need a big re-think."

Submission number

S-41-1

Consultee number

1400865

Date

09/02/2026

Comments

I am writing as a local resident with concerns over the Possible Proposal for an MCA Scheme Land at Ardersier Mains, Ardersier IV2 7QN and IV2 7ST. I am opposing the proposal as it will

change the fundamental nature of the village, and it is conflict with the Local development plan. I have the following specific comments, concerns and recommendations: Issue 1: The edge of the development from NH78397 55036 to NH 78247 55531 and on to NH78301 55580, is at the top of a steep wooded bank. This edge is of importance as : a. The trees structurally stabilises the bank and provide a wildlife area, b. The bank has groundwater flow paths which change affect the surface water on the high street below and associated properties , c. The bank and tree provides the skyline for the village and from the beach. Recommendation issue 1: 1. The structural stability of the bank is investigated (not intrusively) and considered. The development is planned to ensure that ground water flow paths and bank stability are maintained. 2. A buffer strip of at least 30 meters is applied before homes or gardens and planted with native woodland. This should be 'defensive planting' to discourage recreational use. This new woodland strip would maintain the wildlife value of the existing area, maintain a comparable skyline as currently exists for the village, reduce light and noise pollution. This strip should be planted at the start of construction work, and then this area should be the last constructed. This is to enable the area to mature and establish prior to construction and occupancy. Issue 2: The Road from NH78335 55020 to NH79166 54766, and the spur to NH 79656 56162, and NH 78978 56299, are currently minor roads with heavy recreational use. They are integral parts of active transport routes to Carse woods, the ranges, a loop to Fort George, and access to the network of minor roads towards Cawdor. They have heavy usage by runners, dog walker, and cyclists. This mixed use is suitable currently due to the low traffic and domestic nature of the traffic. The field on either side of these roads are corridors for wildlife movement including deer, hares, and badgers. This enables movement between Carse Wood and the ranges, the wooded bank east of the high street, and the common/ beach area. Recommendation issue 2: 1. These routes will need to be upgraded for the increased traffic. Separate high-quality traffic-free active transport routes should be implemented at the start of the construction and remain in perpetuity, with equivalent connectivity for people to the ranges, Carse Wood, looping back to Fort George and to access the network of minor roads heading towards Cawdor. There should be accompanying greenspace retained or developed along the active transport routes so that the high value amenity value is maintained in this deprived community - an important aspect for many residence health and wellbeing. 2. A dark corridor of high-quality greenspace and suitable biodiversity should be protected and improved to enable existing wildlife pathways to be maintained. It may be possible to combine or co-locate these two aspects, but that will require careful design, considering both the needs of people and wildlife. Issue 3: This is a significant area of development and normally light pollution would accompany that. This is harmful for people, wildlife and has a high carbon cost. Street lighting adaptation strategies in England and Wales | LSHTM Evidence Bank Recommendation issue 3: I propose that all streetlights installed are dimming and are only on full brightness between 7 am and 9pm, between 12pm and 6am the lights should be off, with dimming lights between these times. This is carbon saving, protects dark spaces for wildlife and reduces the light impact on the Ardersier. Issue 4: At NH78297 55579 the path known locally as sandy brae links the top of the ridge with the recreational land, the beach and the old village. This path is unstable with rain causing erosion. The location of the houses indicated that this is likely to become a more heavily used active travel route. Recommendation issue 4: Sandy Brae is stabilised and upgraded to enable safe pedestrail and cycle useage. Upgrading / stabilising should be done working with nature (e.g. tree planting) not using tarmac and lighting on a dynamic bank. Issue 5: Ardersier currently lacks an active travel link to Inverness airport train station. This would also link with a network of track that enable active travel to Culloden and Inverness. With the increasing size of the village, and demand on the local roads maintaining and improving viable and safe active travel routes

to connect with Nairn, Inverness, Croy and Cawdor becomes essential. Recommendation Issue 5: A traffic free active travel route to the Inverness airport train station is developed and implemented prior to construction at this development. Issue 6: The road network linking to and accessing the A96, is currently not fit for purpose. The narrowness and speed of vehicles on the main Ardersier Inverness route, makes it unsafe for any road users other than cars, isolating the village. The use by cars does not meet current standards for road width, visibility and junctions. Recommendation issue 6: All access points from Ardersier to the A96 should be improved, including the main link to Nairn, the crossroad toward Croy and the access near Castle Stewart. This is to enable the anticipated increase in vehicles safely use the roads. Issue 7: The broadband speeds in the village are currently limiting the ability for people to work from home. Recommendation issue 7: The telephone / broadband network is upgraded for all in the village. I would ask you to consider whether a development of this scale is appropriate to this location, and whether the infrastructure can be upgraded to meet the needs of this further development. If you decide to allow it, please can it be significantly reduced in size and the recommendations be implemented. These are not comprehensive but represent an individual's suggestions to mitigate and reduce the negative impact of development at this location.

Submission number

S-40-1

Consultee number

1400864

Date

09/02/2026

Comments

I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. The road infrastructure in and around the small historic fishing village of Ardersier cannot accommodate the extra volume of traffic an additional 600 houses would generate, nor the construction traffic involved in such a large development. There are 3 roads in and out of the village, all of which exit onto the A96. The volume of traffic on the A96 itself has increased significantly of late with the increase of the number of houses being built between Nairn and Inverness. The Old Military Road (B9039), continuing past Castle Stuart to Newton of Petty. Getting out onto the A96 is becoming more and more difficult with the increase in the volume of traffic, causing frustration for drivers – this will lead to people taking chances and more accidents. Cars on the A96 do not slow down to allow people to get out. The general condition of this road is not good, particularly when we have had rain – the puddles that form on the road are deep and are unavoidable with oncoming traffic (drivers underestimate the amount of water built up). The second bend in the road after Castle Stuart is very prone to flooding. There are no lines painted at the sides of the road, not are there any cats eyes to help with driving in the dark. This road has seen a fair number of accidents and sadly there have been fatalities too. 2. The Old Military Road (B9006) towards Gollanfield. This road is narrow (not standard width) and it is tight for 2 cars passing each other heading in opposite directions, especially on the railway bridge. My husband has had personal experience of a camper van passing him on this bridge and taking off the wing mirror off his car. The bridge nearer the

village is weak and has only recently been repaired. 3. Nairn Road (B9092). The section of Nairn Road that runs between the B9039 and the B9006 has no safe crossing to the primary school and other amenities in the village. Springfield had committed to installing a crossing as part of their development in Connage Crescent, but to date that has not materialised. Springfield have said that the single track road leading up past Fulmar Crescent (highlighted in yellow) to the houses at the top of the hill at Hillhead and to the cemetery will be done away with. When asked what the new access would be, it was said that the plans were at an early stage, and this has not yet been decided. Assuming the other road past Ardersier Mains to Nairn Road is left in tact, if the people living in the houses at Hillhead (circled in red) want down to the High Street to the amenities and bus stops, will they be expected to have to go half way round the village to get there (blue line)? How can we be asked to make a decision on the MCA when there are no plans (even at a high level) upon which to base things on, only an outline on a map showing the land ringfenced for the development? There is much confusion within the community in Ardersier regarding the what why and how" of an MCA the process and why it is being used as a planning tool for this proposed development. The Council needs to do more to explain and clarify the relevance of this planning tool to the community. At the meeting that took place in the Ardersier War Memorial Hall on 6th January 2026 we were told that Springfield plans to build 600 houses on the land to the east of Ardersier adjacent to Ardersier Mains and that the Highland Council wish to pilot the MCA process for this development. That was about all we could glean from the meeting - there were no concrete plans from the developer no concrete answers to questions raised. I oppose the MCA. The geomorphology of Ardersier is post-glacial. There is a history of underground springs crossing the proposed development area with flooding being experienced in this area. My concern is that any work undertaken by the developer to mitigate this will have a knock-on effect causing the underground water to flow downhill and affect the houses below the site in Fulmar Crescent in the High Street and along Station Road and Station Drive. I oppose the MCA. School infrastructure and health care provision: The Highland Council representative told us at the initial meeting on 6th January that there was capacity within the school rolls of Ardersier Primary and Culloden Academy to accommodate the potential increase in pupil numbers that a development of 600 houses could bring about. There were teachers at that meeting who currently work in these schools and did not agree. Culloden Academy now has so many temporary buildings in its grounds that there is a distinct reduction in outdoor social space for the pupils during break times. A member of the parent council mentioned that the previous head Dr Vance was concerned about the potential health and safety impact on the pupils when poor weather prevents the pupils from going outdoors during breaks as there is insufficient indoor recreational space. The Nairn Healthcare Group serves a patient list of around 15841 registered patients (as of late 2025) providing services for Nairn and the surrounding areas which includes Ardersier and Tornagrain (where 300 of the 5000 planned houses have already been built). There is also the new housing development of 300 houses at Delnies. Most dental practices are not taking on new patients. A family I know in Ardersier travels to Invergordon for dental treatment. Raigmore Hospital has around 450-460 beds 9 operating theatres and a 16-bed critical care unit. The A&E department cannot deal with the number of patients attending - hearing about patients having hours-long waits in an ambulance before being seen is not uncommon. How can any further expansion of housing be approved in the Inverness area when the fundamental supporting infrastructure and services are not being put in place beforehand? It does not compute. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. Conservation: It appears that the developer is proposing to build close to the village conservation boundary. The plan in the document on the Highland Council website titled Ardersier Board.indd indicates the proposed location of the water main runs along the road

from Arderiser Mains up to Hillhead through the garden of the first house and out towards Cromal Hill and the viewpoint before circling back along the boundary along the ridge between the proposed development and the houses on the High Street backing onto the hill below. Developer sites constructed close to or on the border of any conservation areas require particular scrutiny and sensitive decision-making by the planning authority. I oppose the MCA in Ardersier. I have serious concerns about the ethics and credibility of Springfield Developments. The company was prosecuted (HSE case no 4474517) for environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegations]. For example a contractor who found asbestos on the Milton of Campsie site successfully won his case for compensation on Aug 26th 2025 after Springfield Developments was prosecuted (HSE case no 4474517) and fined by HSE. How can The Highland Council engage with a company that undertakes such practices? How can we the residents of Ardersier be sure that Springfield will not bring these practices to our historic fishing village where it plans to build close to an SSSI and on the boundary of a conservation area? "

Submission number  
S-39-1

Consultee number  
1400227

Date  
05/02/2026

#### Comments

While not in objection to new development in principle, its success depends on firm, up front commitments to infrastructure delivery before development, in line with NPF4 Policy 18 (Infrastructure First) and The Highland Council's adopted planning frameworks, including the Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP), IMFLDP2 (2024) and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance (2018). I have a young family and understand the present housing pressures but also the importance of place and community for people of all ages and backgrounds. I see the MCA as an opportunity for the Highland Council to set an example of sustainable development being mindful of the existing community whilst offering a holistic approach to the development's needs and setting. If executed poorly it will result in a segregated village, lacking cohesion and pride with further distrust for the council which builds upon previous failures and broken promises. If executed well it can revitalise the village offering new community building projects, commuting opportunities and a boost of tourism from near and wide. Whilst I have concerns regarding the suitability of the site based on archaeological, ground stability and lack of headroom within the existing services and transport options, my response focuses on providing constructive input to ensure a successful, community led development that meets NPF4 and The Highland Council's own planning frameworks whilst highlighting key constraints that must be considered for development of the site. My key points are as follows: 1. Primary healthcare; 2. Primary education; 3. Digital (internet) and electricity infrastructure; 4. Active travel connectivity for work, tourism and wider regional movement (Nairn, Inverness and Inverness Airport Railway Station); 5. Community & Sports Hubs (taking

inspiration from Highland success at Strathearn and Achtercairn); 6. Safeguards must be provided to Archaeological features; and 7. Preservation of the Dark Skies. 1.

Healthcare Provision – Infrastructure First Must Be Actioned, Not Assumed There is currently insufficient primary healthcare capacity to support up to 600 additional homes at Ardersier-based catchments. NPF4 Policy 15 (Local Living & 20 Minute Neighbourhoods) requires that essential services be accessible within a short walk/wheel/cycle, yet the existing service network is already stretched. To ensure compliance with Policy 18 (Infrastructure First), the MCA should explicitly require: A Health Needs Assessment agreed with NHS Highland, identifying demand arising from the MCA and setting out the scale of new local provision required. Investment within the existing Ardersier Doctors Surgery including upgraded facilities and staffing. A safeguarded site for a flexible local healthcare hub, delivered alongside early phases of housing (not as a late-stage aspiration). Binding phasing and occupancy triggers, secured through conditions and Section 75 obligations, preventing unsustainable strain on existing facilities. 2. Primary Education – Capacity and Delivery Mechanisms Required Before Consent NPF4 emphasises co-ordinated, plan led infrastructure, and the Highland Council Developer Contributions Guidance makes clear that where school capacity is exceeded, development cannot proceed without proportionate mitigation. Given the expected scale of new housing: A School Roll Forecast and Contributions Report must be prepared, identifying pressures on Ardersier Primary and linked secondary schools. The MCA must detail capital expansion requirements, land needs (if any), and phased delivery aligned to housing completions. All contributions should be secured at MCA stage to avoid deferring vital decisions to individual planning applications. The new primary school for Tornagrain demonstrates the principle that large-scale housing must be accompanied by new school capacity. This has to be the case in Ardersier too.

Without this, the proposal would conflict directly with NPF4 Policy 16 (Quality Homes), which requires that development “support the delivery of local infrastructure and services

3. Digital and Electricity Infrastructure – Future Proofing Required 3.1. Digital Connectivity (Internet) - Essential for Economic Resilience, Local Living and Tourism Ardersier currently experiences patchy and unreliable broadband, despite the importance of connectivity for home working, small business activity, remote learning and modern healthcare access. Under NPF4 Digital Infrastructure policy, and consistent with Highland Council priorities, the MCA must require: Gigabit capable fibre to premises (FTTP) for every home and business from day one. Provision of open-access ducting, enabling multiple digital providers. Demonstrated compatibility with Scottish Government programmes (e.g., R100) to avoid over build or stranded assets. Upgrades to the existing fibre and 5G network to ensure that throttling during peak hours is not further exacerbated by the significant increase in demand. 3.2. Electricity Network Capacity With low carbon heating, EV charging and wider electrification, a Distribution Network Operator (DNO) capacity statement is essential before consent is granted. This assessment must: Confirm available capacity and identify upgrades or substations required. Provide a phasing and reinforcement schedule aligned with build-out. Ensure no homes are occupied until network upgrades are commissioned. Failure to plan electricity infrastructure up front is incompatible with NPF4 Policies 18 (Infrastructure First) and 19 (Heat & Cooling). 4. Active Travel – A Fundamental Requirement Under NPF4 For Work, Tourism and Everyday Living Active travel connectivity is one of the MCA’s most significant deficiencies. Under NPF4 Policy 13 (Sustainable Transport) and Policy 15 (Local Living & 20 Minute Neighbourhoods), new

development must prioritise safe, direct and attractive walking, wheeling and cycling routes before accommodating private car trips. This provides a distinct opportunity for the MCA and existing Ardersier to thrive as a community with additional commuting and tourism opportunities and help boost Active Travel to Schools – A Council Priority. If delivered affectively and early in development, active travel can allow NPF4 Policy requirements to be met. 4.1. Connectivity Needs (a) Ardersier ” Inverness Airport Railway Station This is an essential corridor for both commuting and tourism. A high-quality active travel link—similar to the Tornagrain to Inverness Airport Station shared use path—must be delivered in early phases of the MCA, including: A continuous, segregated walking/wheeling/cycling route. Inclusive design standards (Cycling By Design / Designing Streets / Highland Council RTGND). Secure cycle parking and wayfinding at key junctions. (b) Ardersier ” Nairn and Ardersier ” Inverness Active travel options are currently fragmented and unsafe along trunk road interfaces. The MCA must provide: A strategic active travel spine connecting Ardersier to both Nairn and Inverness. Upgraded crossings and protected lanes along sensitive stretches. Links to the regional network, mirroring the quality of routes seen between Forres, Findhorn and Culbin, which show how well executed infrastructure can enable everyday travel, tourism cycling and leisure access. High Schools in Nairn, Culloden and potentially Tornagrain in the future require active travel links from the MCA to align with Council priorities for Active Travel to Schools. (a) Ardersier ” A96 Express bus services run frequently less than 3km from the MCA along the A96 stopping near Brackley but will be inaccessible via safe active travel routes without investment. The access tracks and PRI works for the development construction must include active travel allowances, potentially via the disused railway alignment to unlock these express routes throughout the lifecycle of the MCA. (d) Internal Active Travel Network The MCA must be designed such that walking and cycling are the obvious first choice, with: A permeable street network Safe, overlooked routes Low speed streets (20mph) Direct access to services (health, retail (the Connage, education) within a 20 minute catchment (Opportunities to rely on Nairn, Tornagrain, Croy & Culloden for these services as within 20 minute cycle suitable for all ages and abilities if the infrastructure is delivered) End of trip facilities (e.g., secure cycle storage such as at Inverness Airport Train Station) (e) Tourism Led Active Travel Opportunities – Moray Firth Coast Route Integration Beyond local commuting and school access, Ardersier sits in a strategically important location for cycle based tourism and long distance leisure travel. The MCA therefore has a unique opportunity—and responsibility—to integrate with several nationally and regionally significant active travel corridors, including: The Moray Firth Cycle Route, a well used coastal touring network attracting visitors across the Highlands and beyond. Connections towards the Great Glen Way and other long distance routes that form part of Scotland’s growing active travel tourism economy. Local core paths and coastal access routes linking key landmarks such as Castle Stuart, the Connage the Secret Beach, Fort George, and the wider Moray Coast Trail. The demand for a continuous, safe, scenic coastal route through Ardersier is already evident from existing visitor behaviour, informal walking/cycling desire lines, and uptake of comparable coastal sections elsewhere in the region. Establishing this connection would: Position Ardersier as a gateway node on the Moray Firth recreational network. Increase footfall to local businesses, cafes, heritage attractions, and the proposed community hub. Enhance tourism related employment and seasonal economy diversification. Provide a high amenity, low carbon travel corridor for both residents and visitors. Culbokie Active Travel Village is an example of where The Highland Council has been left to pick up the cost of developing active travel infrastructure within existing development. This cannot be the case in Ardersier and it must be the responsibility of the Developer. Without these elements, the proposal will fall short of both NPF4 and the Place Principle. 5. Community & Sports Hub – A Legally Enforceable, Phased

Infrastructure Requirement To comply with NPF4's place based approach, the Place Principle, and Highland Council's ambitions for resilient, healthy, 20 minute neighbourhoods, the Ardersier MCA must secure, from the outset, a legally binding obligation for the delivery of a Community & Sports Hub as core infrastructure. This must be delivered early, through Section 75 obligations, with clear phasing triggers tied to housing completions. The hub cannot be left as an aspirational later phase; it is a foundational component of sustainable development and essential to ensure community needs are met before growth places pressure on existing services. 5.1 Why the Hub Is Required A Community & Sports Hub is necessary because: NPF4 Policy 15 requires communities to have accessible indoor and outdoor recreation, cultural, social and learning spaces within walking or cycling distance—i.e., a functioning 20 minute neighbourhood. The Highland wide Local Development Plan and Developer Contributions SG identify community, leisure and sports facilities as legitimate categories requiring developer-funded mitigation where existing provision is inadequate. Ardersier currently lacks indoor sports provision, all weather training facilities, and flexible community space scaled to accommodate an additional 600 homes. Existing facilities cannot meet projected demand.

The hub is therefore not optional infrastructure; it is a policy mandated, capacity driven necessity. 5.2 What the MCA Must Deliver – A Strathdearn/Achtercairn Inspired Hub A. Core Facilities Required Drawing on the highly successful Strathdearn Hub (Tomatin) and the award winning Achtercairn regeneration (Gairloch), the Ardersier Hub must include: A covered indoor sports hall suitable for year round multi sport use (e.g., badminton, 5 a side, fitness classes, youth clubs). Flexible, multi purpose community rooms for social groups, adult learning, digital access, cultural events and drop in services. Outdoor MUGAs or all weather pitches, with appropriately shielded lighting and curfews to minimise light pollution. Fully accessible design, supporting users of all ages and abilities, including people with physical, sensory, learning or long term conditions. Integrated cycle parking, secure lockers and EV enabled bays supporting low carbon travel. B. Lessons from Achtercairn: A Proven Highland Model The Achtercairn development offers a model of what Ardersier can achieve when community infrastructure sits at the heart of new housing: Housing, training, social and commercial facilities were integrated to meet complex community needs.

Community spaces enabled local enterprise, social events and lifelong learning. A design ethos centred on inclusion created pathways to employment for residents with disabilities, through accessible workspace, training facilities and small business units. The development was shaped by over 50 community representatives, demonstrating the success of shared governance and local ownership. By embedding active travel routes linking homes to the centre, Achtercairn strengthened internal movement, supported tourism, and increased footfall to local businesses. This is the standard the Ardersier MCA must follow: infrastructure first, community led, inclusive and economically enabling. C. Ardersier Specific Opportunities Ardersier Port previously proposed (then withdrew) a visitor centre and cafe. The MCA provides an opportunity to restore good faith and deliver benefits consistent with earlier aspirations. The hub could incorporate: A local heritage and nature museum, showcasing glacial formations, coastal ecology, Highland Clearances history, traditional crafts (basket weaving, fishing, farming), Fort George heritage and the story of Ardersier Port—past, present and future. Space for local crafts, community enterprise and small business incubation. Indoor spaces for year round wellbeing programmes supporting young people, families and older residents. This reinforces Ardersier's cultural identity and provides an economic boost aligned with tourism and placemaking objectives. 5.3 Tying the Hub to Active Travel, Tourism and Regional

Connectivity The hub must act as a destination anchor for the MCA's active travel network. By situating key facilities on or adjacent to strategic walking and cycling routes, the hub will: A. Connect Ardersier to Nairn, Inverness & Inverness Airport Railway Station Mirroring the success of the Forres–Findhorn–Culbin active travel network, this approach would: Support regional tourism flows (e.g., long distance cyclists, walkers, day visitors). Provide a natural rest stop and amenities node along the coast to coast green corridors. Encourage behaviour change away from car dependency by linking recreation and services to safe, convenient active travel routes. B. Integration with High Life Highland (HLH) Partnership with HLH can deliver: Discounted or integrated memberships for MCA & Ardersier residents. Cross access to regional leisure centres. Active travel incentives, such as “cycle to hub rewards, HLH credits, or free classes for car free journeys. This replicates the successful community enterprise–sport synergy demonstrated at Strathdearn.

#### 5.4 Legal Structure & Phasing Requirements

To prevent the hub from becoming an unfunded aspiration:

1. Binding Section 75 Obligations The MCA must secure commitments requiring the developer to: Provide fully serviced land for the hub at no cost to the community. Fund and construct Phase 1 (community rooms and indoor multi use space) before the 100th home is occupied. Deliver subsequent phases (e.g., indoor hall, MUGA, heritage elements) tied to further housing completions.
2. Phased Occupancy Controls No more than a defined number of homes may be occupied until: The indoor community facilities are complete. The covered sports hall / MUGA is operational.

Active travel connections between the hub, village centre, schools and regional routes are in place.

3. Long Term Stewardship A governance model—such as an Ardersier Community Trust—must be established early, ensuring: Affordable public access, Transparent reinvestment of any revenue streams, Financial sustainability and community ownership over the long term. This proven approach mirrors the Strathdearn and Achtercairn models.

#### 5.5 Why Ardersier Must Adopt This Model

The benefits demonstrated in other Highland communities are clear: Improved health and wellbeing through accessible sport and social activity. Increased tourism spend and stronger village economies. Enhanced social cohesion and civic identity. Skills development and inclusive employment, particularly for people with disabilities. Reduced car dependency, consistent with NPF4 Policy 13. A sustainable, resilient settlement aligned with 20 minute neighbourhood principles. These are outcomes grounded in real Highland practice—not theory.

#### 5.6 Summary

The Ardersier MCA must include a mandatory, phased and fully funded requirement for a Strathdearn inspired, Achtercairn proven Community & Sports Hub, delivering: Indoor and outdoor sports facilities, Flexible community and cultural space, Tourism linked heritage offerings, Integrated active travel connections, Inclusive employment and training opportunities, And a governance model ensuring long term sustainability. This is the only credible way to comply with NPF4 Infrastructure First, meet Highland Council's policy requirements, and ensure Ardersier becomes a genuinely healthy, inclusive, resilient and vibrant rural community.

#### 6. Archaeological Sensitivity, Scheduled Monument Context & Required Safeguards

There are significant archaeological concerns associated with the proposed Ardersier MCA, particularly given its position between two nationally important Scheduled Monuments: SM5001 (immediately south of the site) and MS2823 Cromal Mount (to the north east). Both monuments are of the medieval period and should not be viewed as isolated features. Their spatial relationship strongly suggests a wider interconnected archaeological landscape—one that the proposed development sits directly between, in a location likely to have held strategic, agricultural and possibly settlement significance during the medieval period and other eras.

#### 6.1. Scheduled Monument SM5001 –

Likely Extent Beyond Current Recorded Boundary Although SM5001 is a protected site, its registered extent is constrained by modern roads, notably the B9092, which truncates the recorded outline. Historic landscape analysis and experience across the Highlands show that such administrative boundaries rarely represent the true historic footprint of a monument. It is therefore highly likely that the original extent of SM5001 extends northwards, beyond the B9092 and into the proposed development area, meaning the MCA site lies within an area of heightened archaeological sensitivity.

6.2. Relationship Between SM5001 and MS2823 Cromal Mount Evidence suggests that SM5001 and MS2823 Cromal Mount are part of a broader medieval landscape, possibly associated with territorial control, ceremonial activity, agriculture, settlement or other forms of socio economic organisation. The proposed development area lies directly between these two Scheduled Monuments, making it extremely plausible that: The land formed part of the functional landscape linking the monuments. Archaeological features, deposits, or structures associated with either or both monuments survive below the current ploughsoil. The area served as a corridor of activity, given its elevated, well drained and agriculturally productive character.

6.3. Survival of Below Plough Archaeology – High Risk Demonstrated by SM5001 The fact that SM5001 survives despite centuries of ploughing is a critical indicator. It demonstrates that archaeological deposits remain intact below the plough level, including: Structural remains Ditches, pits and post holes Occupation horizons Artefactual deposits Environmental samples (charcoal, pollen, grain) Given that the development area shares similar soil conditions, agricultural history and landscape position, it cannot be ruled out—and indeed is probable—that further significant archaeological features remain preserved beneath the disturbed upper horizon.

6.4. Prime Agricultural Land and Elevated Position – Strong Indicators of Past Use The site’s high quality agricultural soils and elevated, naturally defensible position would have been attractive for medieval and earlier settlement, farming and movement. Highland archaeology consistently shows that such landscapes contain layers of activity from multiple periods, even when surface visibility is low.

6.5. Required Archaeological Measures – Before Any Ground Disturbance To comply with NPF4 Policies 7 and 28 (Historic Environment) and The Highland Council’s heritage protection requirements, no development or intrusive ground investigations (including geotechnical trial pits, boreholes, trenching or service runs) should occur until a suite of archaeological interventions is completed:

A. Comprehensive Pre Determination Archaeological Surveys Full desk based assessment Geophysical survey across all developable land Evaluation trenching to test geophysical anomalies and negative areas Topographic survey where appropriate

B. Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACoW) – Mandatory An Archaeological Clerk of Works must be present at all times during any form of ground breaking activity, including: Site investigations Ground investigation surveys Drainage and services Foundation works Landscaping or track formation

C. Archaeological Mitigation Strategy Before any works commence, the developer must prepare and agree a legally binding mitigation strategy with: The Highland Council Historic Environment Team (HET), and Historic Environment Scotland (HES) This strategy must include methods for excavation, recording, sampling, conservation and, where possible, preservation in situ.

6.6. Statutory Stakeholder responsibility These features must be of key concern to HES and The HET which each have well established statutory responsibilities and documented planning practice demonstrating that they: Intervene, object, or require redesign where development threatens Scheduled Monuments or areas of archaeological sensitivity. Require extensive archaeological investigation before determining applications that may harm undiscovered or poorly understood heritage assets. Uphold national policy obligations under the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) and NPF4, which require avoidance of adverse impacts on nationally important archaeology. HES’s published guidance confirms its responsibility to ensure that

development does not damage the historic environment and that it provides expert statutory advice on planning decisions. Likewise, The Highland Council's Historic Environment Team—responsible for maintaining the Highland Historic Environment Record (HER)—provides formal consultation responses on planning applications, ensuring that archaeological sites are protected and that Planning authorities adopt a “proactive, consistent approach to safeguarding heritage. Given this established practice, the archaeological conditions present at Ardersier—particularly its position between Scheduled Monuments SM5001 and MS2823 Cromal Mount, the likelihood that the true extent of SM5001 extends into the development area, and the strong evidence for below plough archaeological survival—are exactly the type of circumstances under which HES and THC have historically objected to or constrained development proposals.

6.7.

Summary Given that the development site sits between two Scheduled Monuments of medieval origin, that SM5001 almost certainly extends beyond its present mapped boundary, and that archaeological features demonstrably survive beneath ploughed soils, the entire MCA area must be treated as an archaeologically sensitive zone. Extensive surveys, strict mitigation, and continuous professional oversight are essential prior to—and during—any intrusive work. Such precautions are not optional; they are necessary to protect nationally significant heritage assets and to ensure the MCA complies with statutory requirements and best practice across Scotland.

7. Light Pollution, Dark Skies, and Ecological Impacts – Need for Strict Lighting Controls within the MCA Ardersier and the wider Moray Firth coast benefit from exceptionally dark northern skies, offering residents and visitors the chance to experience clear views of stars, meteor events and the aurora borealis—a defining characteristic of the area and an increasingly important draw for nature based and astro tourism. These dark skies are a valued natural asset that materially contributes to local wellbeing, landscape quality, and the region's tourism economy.

However, the proposed MCA poses a significant risk of increased light pollution, which would have multi layered impacts:

7.1. Impacts on Human Wellbeing Artificial lighting at night is well recognised as a source of: Disrupted sleep cycles and circadian rhythms, Reduced visibility of the night sky, diminishing cultural, recreational and educational value, Degraded sense of place in rural communities where dark skies are integral to local identity. Protecting darkness is therefore not only an environmental matter but a public health and quality of life requirement, aligning with the wellbeing focus in NPF4's Liveable Places policies.

7.2. Ecological Impacts on Wildlife Light pollution directly affects: Nocturnal animals, including bats, owls and small mammals whose foraging and navigational behaviours are light sensitive, Migratory and coastal bird species, which can become disoriented by poorly directed or overly bright lighting, Insect populations, which are highly vulnerable to light attraction mortality, with knock on effects for pollination, food webs and biodiversity. Given that the MCA lies within a high value coastal and agricultural landscape, limiting light pollution is essential to safeguarding ecological function and biodiversity networks.

7.3. Threats to Aurora & Dark Sky Visibility The northerly aspect from Ardersier towards the Black Isle, Moray Coast and open northern horizon is exceptionally well suited for observing: Dark sky constellations, Seasonal auroral displays, Low light marine and atmospheric phenomena. These experiences drive local tourism, support hospitality and outdoor recreation businesses, and contribute to Scotland's emerging astro tourism sector. Any unmanaged lighting associated with the MCA risks permanently degrading this asset.

7.4. Required Lighting Controls for the MCA To avoid irreversible impacts on human health,

wildlife, and tourism value, the MCA must include strict, enforceable lighting requirements as part of its infrastructure first obligations. These should include: Full cut off, downward facing luminaires to eliminate upward light spill. Warm spectrum LEDs (<3000K) to reduce ecological disruption. Passive infrared (PIR) / motion activated lighting for paths, driveways and communal areas. Curfews for non-essential external lighting, especially in commercial or community buildings. Zero upward light output (ULOR 0%) for all installed fixtures. Strict limits on column height and lumen output, to ensure lighting is only as bright as safety standards require. No floodlighting of pitches or sports facilities without full shielding, curfews, and community consultation. Requirement for a Lighting Impact Assessment and Dark Sky Preservation Plan before any consent is granted.

7.5. Why Lighting Controls Align With NPF4 and Highland Council Policy NPF4 Policy 3 (Nature Crisis) and Policy 4 (Human Health & Wellbeing) require development to avoid environmental harm and support healthy living conditions. NPF4's climate, biodiversity and placemaking policies all support minimising unnecessary energy use and protecting natural environmental qualities. Highland Council's place based planning principles emphasise protecting local character, natural heritage, and tourism assets—dark skies are core to all three.

7.6. Summary Without binding lighting restrictions, the MCA would cause avoidable and permanent loss of dark sky quality, harm local wildlife, reduce wellbeing, and undermine an important tourism asset. Strict lighting controls—enforced through planning conditions and phased obligations—are therefore essential to ensure the Ardersier MCA does not degrade the unique night time environment enjoyed by both residents and visitors. Conclusion The Ardersier Masterplan Consent Area represents one of the most significant opportunities in recent years to deliver a genuinely sustainable, resilient and well functioning rural settlement in the Inner Moray Firth and wider Highland Council area.

However, this opportunity can only be realised if the MCA is grounded firmly in the Infrastructure First principles set out in NPF4 and supported by Highland Council's established planning requirements. At present, the proposal contains critical gaps in healthcare, education, digital and energy networks, active travel provision, community facilities, heritage protection and environmental safeguarding. Without addressing these deficiencies, the MCA risks placing unsustainable strain on existing services, degrading valued natural and cultural assets, and creating a car dependent, disconnected extension rather than a thriving, integrated community. To ensure Ardersier grows in a way that enhances rather than erodes local wellbeing, the MCA must, at the point of designation, secure legally binding, phased obligations for: Expanded primary healthcare capacity and a safeguarded site for new provision; Primary education infrastructure aligned with roll projections and delivered before capacity is exceeded; Future proofed digital and electricity infrastructure to support modern living, low carbon technologies, and equitable access to services; High quality active travel links connecting Ardersier to Nairn, Inverness, Inverness Airport Railway Station, the A96 express bus corridor, and local schools; A comprehensive Community & Sports Hub inspired by successful Highland exemplars such as Strathdearn and Achtercairn; Archaeological safeguards proportionate to the site's location between two Scheduled Monuments, ensuring heritage assets are understood and protected; Strict lighting controls to preserve dark skies, minimise ecological harm and maintain Ardersier's unique natural character. These requirements are not optional enhancements; they are essential pre conditions for compliance with national planning policy and for ensuring long term community resilience, social equity, environmental protection and quality placemaking. The MCA must therefore be conditioned such that no development proceeds without these infrastructures secured, programmed, and fully funded by the developer from the outset. With these measures in place, the Ardersier MCA has the potential to become a model for rural

sustainable development—a place where people can live healthy, connected, low carbon lives; where heritage and nature are protected; and where community facilities, services and opportunities grow in parallel with new homes. Without them the risks to residents the environment and the integrity of the planning system are too great. For these reasons the MCA should only be approved subject to robust enforceable infrastructure commitments that guarantee Ardersier's future as a vibrant resilient and well serviced community. "

Submission number

S-38-1

Consultee number

1399698

Date

04/02/2026

Comments

Ardersier is a small rural and historic Conservation Village with a tight knit community who place great value on their cultural identity as a rural and farming community. This disproportionate, insensitive and legally risky Masterplan Consent Area development is objected to for a number of reasons. Ardersier is a very small village with minor B roads as access/egress to the main A96 road (which has not yet been duelled despite promises from Scottish Government) and with single track roads with passing places connecting the B roads. None of these B roads have footpaths for safe pedestrian travel, nor are there cycle paths. There are working farms and prime agricultural land on the green belt area completely surrounding Ardersier and valuable woodland which is teeming with wildlife. Ardersier is steeped in military history due to its location alongside Fort George. There are a number of monuments protected by law and Ardersier is completely surrounded by areas of natural beauty which are home to animals which are also protected by law. Cromal Mount is a significant medieval site which is a scheduled monument protected by The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The proposed MCA runs alongside this important historical site. There is a well known badgers set along Cromal Hill (adjoining the proposed MCA site) and it is very common to observe the animals whilst out walking in the farmlands above the village. Badgers are protected by The Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Badgers setts are also protected under The Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011. There are bat roosts in many of the farm buildings around the proposed Masterplan Consent Area. In Scotland, all species of bats and their roosts are legally protected under The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 and NatureScot is the Governing body responsible for issuing protected species licences when any development or action is proposed which may affect bats or their roosts. Surveys require to be carried out by professional Ecologists to establish impact. In addition, the area above the proposed Masterplan Consent Area in Ardersier is a hunting ground for protected birds of prey who are also protected by The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Watching these majestic birds is a privilege and one which must be protected. A Masterplan Consent Area is entirely the wrong mechanism to suggest utilising for any development in such an area, and a Full Planning Application is what Highland Council need to be proposing to consider any development whatsoever in this important historic Conservation area. The proposal of an MCA in Ardersier would result in established planning safeguards being removed and this is in direct contravention to the principles of Scotlands current plan-led planning system. This objection does not oppose development in principle, but opposes the

appropriateness of the MCA mechanism for this disproportionately large and legally risky plan on this particular site. There is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI site - code 71) located around Fort George and along towards Cromal Hill and the village. This SSSI is of huge ecological importance and has provided significant important ecological data. The SSSI is primarily protected in law by The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004. SSSI site code 71 will continue to be subject to further studies gathering research around ice sheet history, the behaviour of the Moray Firth Ice Stream, relative sea level changes and glacier deposition. SSSI site code 71 is incredibly close to where Highland Council and Springfield Developments are proposing this large development is situated, therefore making the streamlined approach of an MCA proposal to be completely inappropriate. A Full Planning Application process is required to consider this crucial factor and to ensure Compliance with Legal and Conservation Obligations and to ensure no harm is done to these important and delicate areas. When considering any possible developments in areas around SSSI's, there are a number of considerations which Local Authorities are legally obligated to consider. The following are just some of the assessments which may require to be carried out - Impact Risk Zones (IRZ's), Habitat Regulations Assessments, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's). Detailed Surveys from Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) also need to be carried out and consultation with SNH needs to be undertaken to determine the sensitivity of the SSSI's features and and the potential impact of a huge development alongside it.

These studies and considerations should ensure that development plans respect the natural heritage of SSSI's and do not compromise the delicate balance of Scotlands protected areas. Ardersier is a Conservation village and the proposed Masterplan Consent Area site for Ardersier is sitting on the adjoining border of the Conservation line designated by The Highland Council in May 1996. The purpose of Conservation status is to ensure that Ardersier's areas character and appearance is preserved, protected and enhanced. The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 places statutory duties on Local Authorities, namely The Highland Council, to ensure a much higher degree of scrutiny when considering any and all building within or surrounding Conservation areas. How then can a faster, and more streamlined approach to planning (avoiding much of the scrutiny which is considered and offered in a Full Planning Application) such as an MCA even be a consideration by The Highland Council when considering risks and impact on this historic Conservation area of a disproportionately large development. It is entirely inappropriate to even consider using the MCA process. The National Planning Policy framework in Scotland states that brownfield sites should be the preferred development sites for Local Authorities, sites which already have good access/egress and accessible infrastructure shops/schools/GP surgery. There are more appropriate sites closer to the A96 and Inverness/Nairn (where infrastructure is already in place to absorb potentially over 2000 people) rather than profit driven developers choosing to destroy green belts, prime farmland, natural habitats and Conservation areas. Ardersier has no infrastructure in place to support a disproportionate development of this size and scale. Presently, there are approximately 1350 people living within this small rural and historic Conservation community with working farms and prime agricultural land all around us. It is a small tight knit community and we greatly value our rural, peaceful way of life. A development of 600 houses would have a catastrophic impact on the rural village way of life, it would turn us into a town and without any infrastructure whatsoever to support this huge change. Many people specifically live here for the peace and tranquility of living around wildlife and woodlands and in small communities. Public Transport links to and from Inverness and Nairn from Ardersier are already woefully inadequate and buses are subject to regular and ongoing changes meaning they remain completely unreliable, and have been for years.

There has been a new train station built next to the airport, however the roads which people

would require to travel on to access this train station are B roads which already experience regular road traffic accidents and there have been a number of deaths on these roads. There has recently been traffic calming measures implemented on the B9039 following road deaths. These small roads barely cope with the traffic they currently experience, never mind adding another 600 houses with the possibility of around 1000 more vehicles requiring access/egress, and requiring to commute to places of work. This would be unsafe and would cost more lives. The area where this Masterplan Consent Area is being considered, is prime agricultural land with several working farms, livestock living there, and crops being farmed on the land. We are living in times where we need to produce more fresh food and farming communities and green belt areas are crucial areas to protect and preserve for future generations, not to destroy in the pursuit of profit with minimal scrutiny of plans. Farmers and their way of life are protected by The Agriculture and Rural Communities (Scotland) Act 2024. The surrounding area has already lost huge areas of farming and agricultural land with the enormous development of land creating thousands of houses at Tornagrain, Nairn, Croy and Smithton. Many of these developments are unfinished to be able to actually assess and establish what housing need still remains. It is not necessary to continue developing on valuable green belt and farming/agricultural land and destroying Conservation areas and farming communities. Highland Council should be following the National Planning Policy framework of building on brownfield sites, where infrastructure is already in place, or at least is more accessible than at Ardersier. The MCA process feels too rushed and with insufficient time, and insufficient crucial information for the community to be properly involved in something which will massively affect their way of life. A Full Planning Application process would also enable the local Community Council to be involved on a Statutory basis, which an MCA process prevents. The 3 access and egress routes into/out of this MCA site to the A96 (B9039, B9006, B9092) are all very small, narrow B roads which are already shared with farming vehicles and machinery. Its not unusual to have to pull completely off the road to allow for large farming vehicles to pass.

To potentially add another 1000 cars commuting in and out of this small peninsula area is at best ludicrous, and at worst highly dangerous. The main commuting route into and out of the village to Inverness and passing the airport (B9039) has already been subject to traffic calming measures, has very regular road traffic accidents and very sadly, several accidents have resulted in deaths on this road. The other 2 routes (B9006 & B9092) are insufficiently wide enough in points to allow two vehicles to pass safely and there are unending farm vehicles using these roads as they go about their business of tending to the land and animals. An MCA process is completely inappropriate to utilise in a green belt area where full transparent assessments of roads are not available for members of the community to scrutinise. The proposed Masterplan Consent Area is an area adjoining Ardersier on an elevated position directly ontop of this Conservation village. Local Authorities have specific Duties and Responsibilities when considering any planning around Conservation areas.

Conservation areas are legally protected by The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. Ardersier local knowledge is being disregarded, as was demonstrated in the meeting in Ardersier with Highland Council and Springfield Developers on 14 January. Local people are aware of, and expressed concerns about our knowledge of a huge number of streams and wells and a historic reservoir in this proposed elevated MCA area, all of which can be viewed on the Highland Historic Environment Record. Historically, the properties which run along the base of this hill (a hill which you propose to build upon) relied upon the local springs and wells to source their water. In 1902, the Queen Victoria drinking fountain was

erected in the village square as a Chalybeate Well, to celebrate Queen Victoria's reign, and it still stands there today, protected by Historic Scotland on their statutory list as an important Historical Memorial in our Conservation village. The Queen Victoria fountain was served by the natural reservoir directly on top of Cromal Hill in the farmland you propose to build on (reservoir visible clearly via National Library of Scotland mapping). When considering a development on an elevated position, with houses directly underneath it, and on land where there are known to be natural reservoirs, springs and wells, then surely the Local Authority has a Duty to ensure full drainage investigations and assessments are carried out and that these are available for the community affected to scrutinise? It is critical for any new development to undertake a number of specific assessments and to be transparent with the community which may be impacted. It is also crucial for any new development to offer Site Specific Evidence (providing calculations and water management plans) and to include and gain consents from the Statutory body SEPA. Drainage Impact Assessments (DIA's), Flood Risk Assessment (FRA's) and Surface Water Drainage Assessments (Sud's) are all necessary when considering the legislation Local Authorities require to adhere to. The Flood Protection (Scotland) Act 1961 & The Flood Prevention & Land Drainage (Scotland) Act 1997 places a Duty on the the Local Authority, namely The Highland Council, who require to publish this crucial information in the planning phases. Any assessments undertaken must be provided by companies and organisations with no affiliation to Local Authority or to Developers, so as to ensure that advice is independent and not biased. An MCA process means that the local community, who may be directly impacted, will not have the opportunity to establish the risks associated with a large development above and alongside them. The residents living all along the High Street and Fulmar Crescent have Common Law rights, and these rights seem to be getting overlooked in the MCA process. A Full Planning Application process would be a more transparent and appropriate process to consider this and allow residents of this village to make informed decisions, it would also allow the Community Council to act in a Statutory capacity, which they cannot do with an MCA. When considering this Masterplan Consent Area proposal, it is important to consider the Developers who Highland Council are proposing to carry out the building of the properties on the site, particularly on a site in a Conservation village where stringent measures are enforced by Local Authorities to ensure integrity, preservation and protection should be of the utmost importance. The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour when considering establishing an evidence base to assess future Risk. The Springfields Developer Properties Group are a company who have demonstrated on a number of occasions that they do not act with integrity and in fact have acted criminally. A developer who behaves with such a lack of integrity, and who demonstrates criminal behaviour should not be involved in any future development, and definitely not one which will potentially completely destroy a small rural Conservation community and destroy swathes of natural habitat and farmland around it. Springfields Developers were fined by the Health Service Executive (Case number 44745117) for breaching Health and Safety laws for the environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegations]. Springfields boast of selling high quality homes, yet court documents highlighted their concealment of dangerous and deadly substances which they then used as backfill [redacted/rephrased – unsubstantiated allegations]. The affected contractor had tried to express concern about risks to his employees who were expected to work as contractors on site without the appropriate PPE when dealing with dangerous substances. The affected contractor successfully received damages from Springfield. There is a class lawsuit being pursued by the contractors involved in handling the deadly waste which remains ongoing in January 2026. There has already been a Springfields development in the village of Ardersier launched in 2020, albeit a much smaller one than proposed at the MCA site.

As a village, we are still integrating all the new families and people into our community. This new development is not without problems and many of the people living there in the high quality homes" Springfields claim to have built are reporting living in substandard quality homes and are experiencing unending issues with plumbing/drainage/internal and external mould/gardens flooding and who are getting absolutely no assistance from Springfields as soon as the ink was dry on their purchase agreements (despite Springfields After Sales promises). Another example of substandard building came from a lady living in one of the Springfields homes in Ardersier who had a Solar Panel assessment carried out on her home with a view to having Solar Panels installed. She was advised that the trusses Springfields had used in her roof were not sufficiently strong enough to hold Solar Panels so yet again this highlights the poor build quality from Springfields. Cost-cutting and profit are clearly more important to Springfields than anything else. In terms of Infrastructure to support the MCA we will no doubt hear about numerous promises made by Springfields as they look to push this profit driven development forward. It is over 5 years on from Springfields first development of houses in Ardersier and the infrastructure they promised to provide to ensure children can safely get to school via a Pelican Crossing linking their development to the rest of the village has not been built. This means children are risking their lives each day trying to cross a busy road to reach their school (a road which would be considerably busier should the MCA go ahead with the potential for an additional 1000 cars travelling in and out the village). I will say once again the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour and we have thus far evidenced nothing but a lack of integrity a lack of help and a lack of interest in supporting infrastructure from Springfields not to mention criminal behaviour and intimidation towards anyone who speaks out against them. Does the Highland Council offer any assurances that dealing with Springfields during an MCA development will be any different for our community? This development is disproportionately large and should not be approved by Highland Council planning.

Highland Council should be severing ties with a developer as dishonest as Springfields and should be seeking to use the streamlined MCA process on established brownfield sites with infrastructure already in place certainly not at historic rural Conservation areas like Ardersier."

Submission number

S-37-1

Consultee number

1399685

Date

04/02/2026

Comments

I object to the use of prime agricultural land for this this development, we will need more land to grow our own food in the coming years, it's a bad site location and is irresponsible of highland council to allow this to go ahead I am informing you the Highland Council of my concerns of the proposed development of 600 houses in Ardersier, as a resident of the village I am most concerned about this because it will destroy the village as we know it.

Historically there are underground springs crossing the proposed MCA site that shift with

weather events, your proposed area always floods, the fear is that this will allow a deluge of ground water to flow into the village flooding the roads and houses, this is seen after heavy rain which runs down the brae and floods the road even though we have drains !!!!!

Submission number

S-36-1

Consultee number

1399675

Date

04/02/2026

Comments

I would strongly object to the purposed plan, there a many reasons why this development would be detrimental to the biodiversity of the wildlife that live in around the area for development. Living at the bottom of the village with a garden that opens out onto a woodland bank I often see many species of animal and birds. There a barn owls, bats, badgers and tawny owls. The list could be endless and this is just an example of the wildlife that would be distributed if there was building work. The local area has already pressured infrastructure with schools, medical practices being pushed to beyond their capacity, adding more than 600 people to the area without a pre planned increase in this infrastructure these will become unsustainable, people will struggle to access appointments with GPs and the schools will not be able to cope in its current state with the additional enrolment. I cannot express enough my concerns for the quiet semi rural village of this development goes ahead

Submission number

S-35-1

Consultee number

1399674

Date

04/02/2026

Comments

I am a resident of Ardersier and wish to object to the proposed building of 600 houses in Ardersier. I think the scale of this building it completely out of scale for a historic village like Ardersier. The current population in around 1300 people and an additional 600 houses with an average of 2 people per house would double the population - it would no longer be a small village but a sprawl of modern homes taking away the character of the village. This is not the correct place to inflict this type of development.

Submission number

S-34-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

03/02/2026

Comments

At the public meeting held on 14th January in the awar Memorial Hall in Ardersier, in response to my direct question, a representative from Springfield Developments told me that local housing associations, including Highland Council, would have up to a 25% stake in the proposed development. If this is the case, could you please tell me what consideration has been given to the provision of housing suitable for the elderly and disabled residents?

Wheelchair accessible homes with wider, outward opening doors, wet rooms, grab rails etc. are essential elements for inclusive living and I ask what consideration Highland Council has given to this matter during the design process of this development?

Submission number

S-33-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

03/02/2026

Comments

There are strong rumours circulating Ardersier that the unclassified road from Station Road passing Fulmar Crescent is to be closed to accommodate the proposed Springfield development. If this is true, could I point out that this is the main route for the people of Ardersier who have family members, friends and other relatives buried in the local cemetery?

Submission number

S-32-1

Consultee number

1399660

Date

03/02/2026

## Comments

I note the above mentioned proposal dated 6th January 2026 on Highland Council's web site (hereafter referred to as "the council) with regard to Springfield Ltd development plan (hereafter referred to as "the developer) to build six hundred houses (600) on land to the East of Ardersier village. I further note the council welcomes feedback from the community and individuals of said community with regard to the proposed use of a Masterplan Consent Area (hereafter referred to as the "MCA). Please find my reasoned and carefully considered opinion as follows and take note of the legislation referred thereto. In the first instance there seems to be considerable confusion within the community regarding the concept, or notion, of what a MCA is and why it is being used as a planning tool in the context of the above mentioned proposal. I contend the council has not done enough to explain, clarify, and clearly demonstrate to the community why this planning approach is relevant to the proposed build. Indeed in my opinion I would argue it is not. There is no legal requirement or compulsion on the council to use this planning tool in the context of the above mentioned proposal other than those specified in the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019 (the 2019 Act), i.e., at the behest of a Minister of State, etc. Further, I note from the public engagement meeting held at the War Memorial Hall, 14th January, the developer proposes to build close, or close to, the village conservation boundary, at height. Whilst more detailed plans have yet to be produced by the developer, I contend that careful scrutiny of said plan(s) will be imperative in the context of the the councils designation: Conservation Area: Ardersier (CON12), grid reference Centred NH 7812 5525 (339m by 647m) and in particular Cromal Lodge.

Moreover, in my opinion, the MCA may preclude matters arising and of concern of this nature. Further, the developer proposes to construct on the land known as Cromal Mount, the highest and most visual point of the area in question. I contend this could materially alter the character of the conservation area of the village. Developer sites constructed close too, or on the border of, any conservation area require particular scrutiny and sensitive decision making by the planning authority. I also draw your attention to NatureScot's web site that highlights key priorities that all local authorities must comply with in the context of the (overall) landscape of a conservation area and/or community. For example, if we imagine the natural landscape – contours and hillsides - from the seaward side of the village, I contend there will be a material change in that view of said topography with properties (potentially) standing proud over the conservation area of the village. I see no mitigating evidence from the authority to date with regard to this point. So once again, in my opinion, further work is requested by the community and how a MCA proposes to mitigate community concerns. A further point to note is the (rumoured) permanent closure of a local road off Station Road and leading up hill, passed Fulmar Crescent and out towards Ardersier Mains and associated farms. My understanding of this process (from memory) is the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (sections 207/208) or the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, I'm not quite sure about the finer points. However what I do remember is that a Stopping Up Order is required – and that process can be a long draw out affair indeed. The public must be notified, objections heard, and the entire matter may be referred to Scottish Ministers. This issue like so many others concerning the proposal remain shrouded in an administrative haze. One particular area of concern I feel compelled to raise is the land in question. The UK Health Security Agency has identified this land as an area of high Radon (01/12/22). A cursory search on the website [www.ukradon.org/information/ukmaps](http://www.ukradon.org/information/ukmaps) and entering the search string "Ardersier" clearly indicates the land, (or parts thereof) has a Maximum Radon Potential greater than 30% and has had for some considerable time. What this

means - in my opinion - it's the highest risk category and Radon legislation in Scotland mandates that all new buildings in affected areas incorporate protective measures against gas ingress. It also places legal requirement on the developer to include full radon measures, including radon barriers, sumps and membranes within the new builds affected, if and when builds are approved. In my opinion it is very concerning that such details are not being investigated further by the authority. Other concerns I raise relate to the infrastructure and roads etc. In particular I raise the matter of school rolls at both primary and secondary level for this catchment area. Figures I have obtained from the councils own web site purport to show a declining school roll at Culloden Academy over the next ten years. However in my opinion I would query the date the forecast was produced and whether the the authority has taken into account the proposed development along with others presently within the academy's catchment. The current figures based on a ten year projection simply do not add up by the Education Service in my opinion. The Stratton development, Tornagrain, the ongoing build at Croy/Culloden and now the new Ardersier proposal, I imagine once again we will shortly see a chronically over capacity academy and perhaps the spectre of Ardersier pupils being bussed to Nairn Academy. To summarise, I see no compelling reason for a MCA in relation to the above mentioned proposal. However I do acknowledge why a MCA is appropriate in certain contexts and I imagine the authority has one eye on the new Whiteness development and associated (projected) jobs etc. However that is not a good enough reason, of and by itself, to use a planning tool like a MCA on Ardersier. The pace of new build developments in and around the area, as mentioned above, along with the new house builds down on the East and West sides of Nairn ought to be more than enough to satisfy the (expected) jobs boom, whenever that is. In the meantime and in my opinion the Ardersier proposal is both contentious questionable. I expect to see the MCA ditched in favour of a screening process, a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment, evidence of consultation with relevant and interested NGO's, a highly detailed traffic management plan and a thorough, detailed Decision Notice.

Submission number

S-31-1

Consultee number

1399623

Date

03/02/2026

Comments

I have no confidence in Springfield Developments. Previously they were fined for dumping hazardous waste on other sites in Scotland. With this prosecution it is disappointing that our planning department at Highland Council seem to have happily climbed into bed with this developer ... very concerning. What is your explanation ? we have a narrow band of the very best of agricultural land between the sea and the heather clad hills. It is really irresponsible to build housing on such a perfect greenfield site. Our children's children may require this land for food production. once it's gone , it's gone. What are your good reasons for continuing with this project ? Grave doubts exist as to whether Springfield Developments can provide decent

infrastructure for the proposed MCA. Can we have a detailed plan of such ? Nairn Road is not sufficient at the moment far less in future coping with hundreds of extra cars. The old military road is too narrow as well as having a weak bridge. Our Surgery is overflowing as it is. ( Don't say that is not your problem, it's an NHS problem ! ) there are also misgivings about the present primary school coping. Are you planning a new one in area 197 ? Incidentally a crossing of Nairn Road for Schoolchildren was promised previously. Why has it not been built ? at a recent meeting between Highland Planning , Springfield Developments and our Community many questions were left unanswered. [redacted – personal details] Springfield's lead representative when asked if they owned the land already , smiled and eventually said it was ' under contract' which could mean anything. It turns out that the land in question was bought last year. Area 197 on the Local Development plan where the site bidder and site owner is Springfield Properties. No correction was made by the [rephrased – personal details] Council officer which leaves an impression of underhandedness . Can you clarify the situation ? The proposed area has always been subject to flooding. The underground springs shift back and forth and a couple of obvious ones come to mind. The permanent flow of water across the bottom of the School Brae together with similar coming down the Rye Brae ( Fulmar Cresc. runs off it at 90° ) With the proposed development much more flooding will be experienced below on the High Street. What mitigation is planned , if any ?

Submission number

S-30-1

Consultee number

1399621

Date

03/02/2026

Comments

I oppose the MCA in Adersier. At the meeting held in Ardersier on 14th Jan-26, the Springfield representative, [redacted – personal details] Springfield's lead representative was asked directly whether the developer, Springfield Properties, owned the land, to which he responded with it is under contract". A quick internet search for what this means states: When a land purchase is "under contract" it means that the seller has accepted a buyer's offer and both parties have signed a legally binding agreement to sell/buy the land. [redacted – personal details] Springfield's Land and Planning Director went on to say that he is not aware of the land being owned by Springfield and if it was it was news to him. The Highland Council Local Development Plan clearly shows Springfield as the bidder for the site and the owner. This raises the question as to why [redacted – personal details] Springfield's lead representative was not open about this - surely in his position within his company he was aware of where ownership lay? It also raises a further question - why did the Highland Council Planner who was chairing the meeting not make any attempt to correct Springfield? If there is such a basic lack of openness honesty and transparency at this early stage I am led to believe that this will not change going forward."

Submission number

S-29-1

Consultee number

1399597

Date

02/02/2026

Comments

I am informing you Highland Council of my concerns and objections about the MCA proposed development of 600 houses at Ardersier. As a habitant & home owner of Ardersier I'm very concerned about this development. The road network to & from the proposed site can no way support construction traffic involved in this development also subsequent future addition of possibly 1,000 vehicles commuting on a daily basis to either Bairn or Inverness through a small historic fishing village. I'm emailing you Highland council to voice my objections to the proposed development of 600 houses at Ardersier. This land is and is still used as agricultural. Today & in the future good agricultural land is needed to produce food either for human consumption or animal feed. This is a bad site location at best & irresponsible of Highland Council to even consider using prime agricultural land for this venture. Once this agricultural land is gone there is no getting it back. I'm emailing as I have concerns on the ecological habitats which would be grossly affected by the proposed development of 600 houses in Ardersier by Springfield development and raise my objections. There is a badger set along Cromal Hill with a trail the badgers use going through the field where these proposed houses will be built. The badgers frequent my garden regularly. Bats fly all around often feeding on insects at this proposed development site whilst nesting in nearby farm buildings. Also Curlews which have been diminishing rapidly lately often feed on the proposed site not to mention a vast array of birds some only seen around Ardersier. If we take away all those wildlife's habitat & feeding areas we interfere in the ecosystem. I understand houses have to be built however this is not the site on prime agricultural land for those houses. I'm emailing to note my concern & objection of the MCA Ardersier development. I'm very concerned about the integrity of the developer Springfield Developments & Highland council. When at the 14th January meeting [redacted – personal details] Springfield's lead representative representing the developer was asked "Did Springfield own the land? he replied it was "Under Contract which left the Ardersier community none the wiser. However according to Highland Councils local development plan area 197 as of May 2025 the site bidder is shown as the above mentioned Mr Stuart Morrison and site Owner Springfield Properties. At the meeting the Highland council representative made no attempt to correct Springfield. How can the people of Ardersier have any trust in Springfield developers or Highland council when statements like the above are stated. I have grave concerns about Springfield developments as a contractor when last year Springfield developments were fined £10,000 (HSE case number 4474517) for environmental dumping of asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation]. As my property is adjacent to the proposed site I have every right to be very concerned of a developer with the above work ethos that brings practices like these to this historical village close to a SSSI and ecological habitats. I'm disappointed how Highland council can condone such practices & support such a developer. A

developer who has a track record of trying to stop a contractor complaining about dumping practices by means of interim interdict. This is in relation to the contractor who found asbestos on the Milton of Campsie site. The contractor successfully won his case for compensation on 26th August 2025. This is the case 4474517 which Springfield developers were successfully prosecuted & fined for. Therefore I have no trust in that local contractors will be met by the same working practices [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation].

Submission number

S-28-1

Consultee number

1399589

Date

02/02/2026

Comments

I write to object to your plan to build 600 houses in Ardersier. The plan is to build on prime agricultural land. This should never have been considered. It is very short sighted to even think of selling off good farm land. I also think putting 600 houses into a small village is a bit of an overkill. It's far too many. I know homes are needed but to be honest, it's council houses that are needed. Most young local families can't afford these big houses. Older people who wish to downsize don't get the choice of a small bungalow and young single people have no chance. I object most strongly.

Submission number

S-27-1

Consultee number

1399573

Date

02/02/2026

Comments

Following the meeting in the village hall on January 14th I have some concerns I would like to raise, Firstly I would like some clarification on the meeting itself, it was set up as a joint proposal from Springfield developers and a representative of the highland council, while not directly mentioned it was implied that a developer had not been selected for the proposal, upon further reading it would seem that Springfield are already on the documentation for the mca leaving no room for the community to select another developer. How can we ensure impartiality going forward when the council and developer are already working together? Secondly the question of who owns the land was asked on multiple occasions with no clear answer, a quick search on

the highland councils own website on the mca shows that the land is already owned by the developer, in the interest of transparency why was this not answered by the council representative? Lastly the figures for school capacities for both Culloden Academy and Ardersier Primary were misleading, the planning department had figures of 85% capacity at Culloden and 64% for Ardersier. These figures fail to calculate how a new development along with other continuing developments would impact on the enrolment numbers and also fail to include real world factors, Culloden Academy has had capped enrolment and temporary buildings have been installed in an attempt to accommodate extra capacity, are these temporary structures now a permanent part of the school? In conclusion this has lead to some confusion surrounding the development, this could be a deliberate misleading of the public and certainly asks questions of the integrity and impartiality of the the planning department within highland council, I will forward this to the local government ombudsman and MSP in the meantime as there is very little time to have any concerns answered in time before the next deadline

Submission number

S-26-1

Consultee number

1399437

Date

30/01/2026

Comments

What will the road infrastructure be to cope with an extra 600-1000 cars at peak times?? This should be a non starter!!

Submission number

S-25-1

Consultee number

1399381

Date

28/01/2026

Comments

I live just outside Ardersier, approximately a mile or so from the proposed development site and have enjoyed living here for some time. While I appreciate the ever growing population of the Highlands and the need for new housing, I feel that this has to be balanced against the need to retain what makes living in the Highlands such a pleasure. I was not entirely surprised to see that there were plans afoot to increase the housing capacity of Ardersier, what did shock me

however was the actual size of the proposed development, 600 houses which almost seems like a doubling of the local housing stock, all built on valuable agricultural land. This appears far to large a burden on the existing local infrastructure.

When you factor in the fact that each house is likely to have at least 2 cars being used by the residents, that equates to a further 1200 vehicles using roads that are barely fit for their current traffic burden. The site proposed is also crossed by several underground springs and water courses, which I am aware have often caused localised flooding. It also forms valuable habitat for wildlife, most notably Badgers, Hares and numerous Birds of Prey. I feel that should the development proceed as proposed Ardersier will become yet another dormitory suburb of Inverness and its unique character will be lost for ever.

Submission number

S-24-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

28/01/2026

Comments

My concern is with regard to the impact of at least 600 extra vehicles and cyclists (proposed 600 homes) on the current road system surrounding the proposed development site and the increased danger to pedestrians, particularly schoolchildren, once completed. The existing road system surrounding the proposed development site is already very hazardous and consists of the B9092, and several category C or unclassified roads or tracks. Currently, the B9092 between Ardersier and the A96 is in poor condition , with many potholes, dangerously soft or sunken verges and no central lane markings along much of its length.

Already, this stretch of road is hazardous, with the current (and increasing) levels of domestic and tourist traffic, agricultural traffic, Military traffic, public transport vehicles, Council service vehicles and the Ardersier Port traffic it currently handles. There has also been a significant increase in cyclists using this road network. The unclassified roads and tracks are already unsuitable for current levels of traffic, with vehicles regularly having to use the verges to pass oncoming vehicles and the addition adding a minimum of 600 vehicles will turn driving, cycling or walking on these roads from hazardous to dangerous.

Submission number

S-23-1

Consultee number

1399359

Date

28/01/2026

Comments

Opposition to the MCA at Ardersier for the following reason This is prime agricultural land and in a time where we may need to produce more food this is bad site location at best and irresponsible at worst. Springfield Developments have been prosecuted (HSE case no 4474517) for environmental dumping of waste including asbestos [redacted – unsubstantiated allegation], we have no faith or trust in a developer bringing these practices to a historic village close to a SSSI and ecological habitats, nor are we happy that the Highland council condone and support a developer who practices in such work ethos. Springfield Developments have a [rephrased - unsubstantiated allegation] track record of trying to interim interdict a contractor who found asbestos on the Milton of Campsie site, he successfully won his case for compensation on Aug 26th 2025 after Springfield developments were succesfully prosecuted and fined by HSE. We therefore have no trust that local contractors will not be met by the same working practices. The integrity of the developer and Highland council is questionable as when at the 14th Jan meeting the developer (Springfield) was asked “did they own the the land? they replied it was “under contract which left the community none the wiser. According to Highland Council local development plan area 197 as of May 2025 the site bidder and owner is shown as Springfield properties, The Highland council(HC)made no attempt to correct Springfield and were clearly at best clueless or at worst trying to avoid confrontation to an already bad situation. This lack of transparency leads us to believe that nothing that HC or springfield developments can be believed reference future schools, roads network etc. The roads network to and from the proposed site can in no way support either the construction traffic involved or the subsequent future addition of possibly 1000 vehicles commuting on a daily basis through a small Historic fishing village. Egress/Acces via B9092 Nairn road has no safe crossing to the primary school, Old military road from Gollanfield is not a standard width and has a weak bridge (recently repaired) Historically there are underground springs crossing the proposed MCA that shift with weather events and the proposed area has always flooded, the fear is that any mitigation to alleviate this will allow a deluge of ground water to flow into village flooding housing and roads on High street. Water has always flowed across high street from the high ground and this can be observed at the bottom of school brae even during dry periods. Ecological habitats will be affected at best and destroyed at worst namely, the badgers along cromal hill, The bats in the farm buildings, the birds of prey feeding on field mice, voles and moles etc

Submission number

S-22-1

Consultee number

1399358

Date

28/01/2026

Comments

I am unhappy about houses being built on prime farm land. We need to preserve our agricultural land for future generations. I therefore protest very strongly against the building of 600 houses on this land.

Submission number

S-21-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

20/01/2026

Comments

My first concern is access to site during the construction phase. This site is serviced by 1x B road and several unclassified roads. During the McPherson's Way development in Ardersier, Nairn Road, Manse Road and Campbelltown were regularly obstructed by site traffic waiting to access the site, causing disruption to traffic flow and an increased danger to children going to school. My concern is that the road system surrounding the proposed development site in Ardersier won't be able to cope with construction and development traffic and will increase the dangers to all drivers and pedestrians using these roads, particularly as the B9092 is our main access route to Nairn.

Submission number

S-20-1

Consultee number

1398700

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

Far too big an area of development which will ruin the village" of Ardersier. Local infrastructure upgrades would have to be in place BEFORE houses were inhabited i.e. school medical facilities shops etc. this scale of development is not suitable as an "add-on" to a village."

Submission number

S-19-1

Consultee number

1398699

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

Why is there a need for such a large development. Surely 50 houses would be enough. Do an MCA all over the Highlands not here.

Submission number

S-18-1

Consultee number

1398698

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

Totally for it. The history of the village is growth in different stages, some small and some large. The original village was created when the small community had to make way for the building of Fort George. Additional housing was then added over a relatively long time.

However, one of the largest increases occurred when the Council built the social housing which vastly increased the size of the village (I was born in one of the Council houses). Then additional Council homes were built along Station road and throughout the village. The army then built some army quarters which then became residences for the community. The village was then extended further when the what I call the 'Campbell town' area was added. Further development in the posh houses" at the side of the old railway line and the last major development was Springfield. Various community council members have come from the Campbelltown ex barracks buildings the houses near the old railway line and the new Springfield. So I would be surprised if they didn't vote for this. Let's hope it's not a case of pulling the latter up after getting into the village. As I said I was born here and have seen changes in the size which I am more than happy about. If it means we can upgrade the school it would be a very good thing. Road improvements exiting the area required to be looked (possible roundabout). Also having a large community would mean a stronger voice in representations to the community council who currently represent the small community and the large communities of Balloch and Culloden."

Submission number

S-17-1

Consultee number  
1398697

Date  
19/01/2026

Comments

We need infrastructure, schools, doctors, shops. Better access roads. Why is there no bungalows for elderly?

Submission number  
S-16-1

Consultee number  
1398696

Date  
19/01/2026

Comments

Site is behind High St Ardersier - glacial deposit of sand where trees are at the back of the High St. This erodes frequently and if built upon could lead to more erosion into households below this steep bit of ground. Infrastructure - High St drains/sewage inadequate due to age of them - adding additional will impact on High Street. Hospitals, schools, GPs, roads, public transport, pharmacy, shops etc all need to be considered / developed alongside existing buildings.

Submission number  
S-15-1

Consultee number  
1398695

Date  
19/01/2026

Comments  
No

Submission number  
S-14-1

Consultee number  
1398693

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

A thorough archaeological investigation A wide tree/ woodland belt along the top of the hill for privacy to the High Street and walks and wind shelter. We need better broadband A wide belt of green space around the scheduled monument Cromal Hill and protection for the Sandy Brae as it is a part of this Scheduled Monument and eroding easily.

Submission number

S-13-1

Consultee number

1398690

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

Leave our village alone

Submission number

S-12-1

Consultee number

1398685

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

I reside in one of the cottages near to the proposed site and have lived in this location with my family for many years. My family and I keep horses, and the quiet, low-traffic nature of the area is fundamental not only to our way of life but also to the welfare and safety of our animals. The scale of this development would represent a significant and irreversible change to the character of the area. The introduction of traffic associated with 600 new households would place considerable strain on the existing road infrastructure, much of which consists of narrow, single-track roads that are not designed to accommodate high traffic volumes. Increased vehicle movements would raise serious safety concerns for residents, pedestrians, horse riders, and livestock, as well as increase the likelihood of accidents. While I acknowledge the growing demand for housing in the north of Scotland, especially as migration to the Highlands increases, this must be balanced against the capacity of local infrastructure and the rights and livelihoods of existing locals.

Development on this scale, in a location so poorly suited to it, risks undermining the rural

environment and quality of life of those who have long established homes in the area. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you require any further clarity on my thoughts on the subject.

Submission number

S-11-1

Consultee number

1398680

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

I was at the event in ardersier and have the following concerns: 1. It is not at all clear what having the designation of an MCA will mean in terms of a change in rules and regulations. I think this needs to be completely clear and transparent to everyone BEFORE such designations are made and that we have the time, as a community, to consider the implications and impact. 2. Based on information received from the community during the event meeting it was clear that there are concerns about the nature of the ground structure and potential for landslides and potential for diversions of springs so this must mean that there cannot be large scale development allowed. Development should therefore be more subdued and modest in its nature 3. My opinion is that Springfield as a developer should first give due diligence and service to those home owners in its first development in the village, (at connage), who have concerns about their houses. They should also finish their obligations, has the school or surgery received anything yet? When will the zebra crossing be finished? What actually has Springfield contributed to the village infrastructure so far, (apart from within their own development) 4. My opinion is that 600 houses is too much and that should be reduced at least by half, if not more. There should be substantial wild spaces, woodland and allotments built into any design/planning for the allocated land.

There should also be a widening of the road and new cycle path to the A96 to allow for the new residents within both new Springfield developments 5. On the broader issue of MCAs I believe the council should instead consider a higher number out of 250 sites. Development should be more considered, sustainable and more diversified. The highland housing alliances or small community trust could be more involved in smaller and more widespread developments.

Submission number

S-10-1

Consultee number

1398679

Date

19/01/2026

Comments

I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the proposed residential development of approximately six hundred houses in Ardersier. I am sixteen years old and intend to build my future in agriculture within this area. My concern is not limited to land use alone but to the wider and long term consequences of placing a large residential development immediately beside an active rural and agricultural environment.

Developments of this scale can significantly compromise the ability of farming businesses to operate in a lawful, safe, and sustainable manner. Agricultural work requires early morning and late night operations, the use of heavy machinery, the movement of livestock, and the application of fertilisers and manure. These activities are not optional but essential to food production. When large numbers of residents move into close proximity to farms, there is often an increase in complaints regarding noise, smells, vehicle movements, and normal working practices. This can result in pressure being placed on farmers to restrict or alter lawful operations, which in turn affects long term viability. There are many documented cases throughout the United Kingdom of farms experiencing increased trespass, vandalism, damage to equipment, interference with animals, dogs worrying livestock, fly tipping, obstruction of access routes, and disputes with nearby residents following the construction of housing developments. These issues frequently result in financial losses, increased stress, and long term uncertainty for those working in agriculture. In addition, a development of this scale would result in a substantial increase in local traffic. This presents clear safety concerns in rural areas where slow moving agricultural vehicles, large machinery, and livestock movements are a daily necessity. Increased congestion and reduced access can make routine farming operations more dangerous and less efficient. Once agricultural areas become surrounded by housing, the long term sustainability of farming in that location is placed at serious risk. This has implications not only for individual farmers but for food security, rural employment, biodiversity, and the preservation of the countryside.

Developments of this nature permanently alter the character of rural communities. I respectfully request that careful consideration be given to the long term impact of this proposal on existing and future agricultural activity within the area. I believe that alternative locations or reduced scale options should be explored in order to protect the continued viability of rural livelihoods.

Submission number

S-9-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

18/01/2026

Comments

Have the existing massive build projects around Inverness over the last 20 years or so alleviated any of the alleged local housing shortage already? New developments are being advertised in England, which means that Highland people either don't want or can't afford what is being built. These new residents will potentially have families which, once earning a Highland wage, will be adding themselves to the housing list, perpetuating the crisis. The housing crisis will continue if the majority of developments are only affordable to people outwith Highland. What is needed is low cost housing that can be earmarked for people already on the council's list of folk needing a home, or for key workers. We need this without the additional expensive housing that developers want to build. Highland Council should innovate here with a different solution to the housing crisis, based on who needs houses, where, and ensure they are affordable to people on the average Highland wage. No more expensive villas and estates. Already communities are ruined by overdevelopment, and without promised infrastructure. Enough is enough.

Submission number

S-8-1

Consultee number

1398554

Date

15/01/2026

Comments

This proposal for 600 new houses which will overwhelm the village of Ardersier is complete utter madness, The roads cannot cope with the increase in traffic .The school is already at near capacity . No new doctors or dentists are proposed .The whole scheme is crazy. thoughtless and environmentally damaging using up valuable arable land . The so called hundreds of new jobs at the port haven't happened ,despite the owners saying it would be up and running last August. [rephrased – believes the port development isn't a viable and legitimate business venture]. As usual the council will overrule any objections and leave a legacy of a small village destroyed by housing with no infrastructure and people with no jobs.

Submission number

S-7-1

Consultee number

1398551

Date

15/01/2026

### Comments

I was unable to attend the scheduled meeting last night to supposedly have our say as a community about the absolutely outrageous plans for our village . I was on nightshift and my husband at home with our young family. I honestly do not know where to begin. I have read lots of comments and see people feel the same . From a selfish point of view I own the house which sits on Station Drive behind the pre existing housing estate. Our view is going to be totally ruined and our home massively devalued . What exactly is planned to back onto us . As a young couple who have worked so hard to allow my husband to build our dream home, is any consideration and green space going to be put there ? Or are we going to end up looking out on the same houses you see jammed together everywhere . I am the chair of Ardersier Primary School/ ELC. I know for a fact the school or nursery has no capacity for all these extra pupils. Tornagrain still has no school . Will existing village residents be given priority for places? The doctors surgery is also nowhere near able to accomodate more people. Appointments are impossible to get as it is. As a staff nurse in Raigmore too I just wonder how many of these estates these big companies will throw up to make money before they need to take accountability and see we need another hospital. We are on opal black level as it is most of the time! More houses go up, but nothing is ever done to reduce bed shortages or waiting lists. So much green space will be lost . This will damage the environment no end . Loss of wild life , birds and insects . More pollution , litter, not to mention the noise etc during building . Transport links are awful. Again, has this been considered! I see that to others this is a money making opportunity. That is it plain and simple. But, this is our home, our village . This scheme is massive . It is going to totally change all of our lives . I really do not believe it has been given any thought what so ever . It is already causing huge stress to myself and husband . I find it beyond unfair that those making the decisions will not be impacted upon. I doubt they would like that built in their back garden. I needed to write this email although I fear there is little point . I look forward to a response.

Submission number

S-6-1

Consultee number

1398547

Date

15/01/2026

## Comments

I am writing to formally express my concerns and strong objections regarding the proposed residential development of up to 600 homes at Ardersier Mains. While I understand the regional need for housing, this particular scale of development is highly unsuitable for our village for the following reasons: Insufficient Infrastructure and Amenities: Ardersier currently lacks the necessary infrastructure to support a sudden population influx of this magnitude. Existing local shops, the primary school, and medical services are already under pressure. Adding 600 homes without a guaranteed, concurrent expansion of these basic amenities will lead to severe service deficiencies for both new and current residents.

Unsuitable Road Networks: The current road infrastructure serving Ardersier is not designed to accommodate the significant increase in vehicle movements that 600 new households would generate. Increased congestion will compromise road safety and negatively impact the rural character of the village. Loss of Village Character: Most residents value Ardersier for its unique village identity and quiet way of life. This proposal represents a disproportionate expansion that threatens to transform our historic village into a sprawling suburb, permanently damaging the community spirit and rural heritage that define the area. I urge the Council and Springfield Properties PLC to reconsider the scale of this development and prioritize the preservation of Ardersier's character and the adequacy of its infrastructure before any final approvals are granted.

Submission number

S-5-1

Consultee number

1398546

Date

15/01/2026

## Comments

Unfortunately I cannot attend tonight due to illness. My question is regarding safety. Will there be a crossing/ pelican crossing situated on Station Drive and what is the plans for the roads around the area where the houses are proposed to be built. Most of the roads around the area where the houses will be are all single track roads. A lot of people including myself regularly walk to the Ardersier cemetery. My last question is the impact on resources.

School. Dr's. Chemist. Broadband.

Submission number

S-4-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

15/01/2026

Comments

My comments are mainly regarding the privacy of certain properties that are in direct link with the boundaries of the proposed Masterplan. I am not in anyway against progress, but I would not like to have a 2 story property overlooking my house. Improved access to Ardersier would also need to be looked at , or alternative access. We already have a 20 restricted area, on narrow roads, with residential parking on it, increased traffic would create all sorts of new problems. I hope that residential owners backing onto this proposed development will be kept fully informed on all the issues and updates as they arise.

Submission number

S-3-1

Consultee number

1398545

Date

15/01/2026

Comments

Advised that the proposed build would be phased. What would the phased plan be?. Has required infrastructure been considered? School capacity GP capacity Transport Services Increased pharmacy and retail use Roads and access. Safety relating to increased traffic volume . Added pressure to health service - GP , Hospital. How will existing residents directly affected be kept up to date with plans? Will this plan go ahead regardless of public concerns?

Submission number

S-2-1

Consultee number

1398544

Date

15/01/2026

Comments

My question is please can you give examples of planning gain" which have been achieved for other communities facing similar developments? [redacted – personal details]. My particular concern is volumes of traffic along the High St. Our house has no foundations ( common for houses of this era). Every time a larger vehicle goes by my house literally shakes. More houses = more vehicles = more shaking of older properties like mine.

Rosemarkie village High St has chicane-like traffic calming- I'd like to see similar in Ardersier to protect older buildings. I imagine residents up Station Rd would also like to see this type of traffic calming as many young people cross that road on the way to school and some people drive very fast up that road. I am also concerned that the local infrastructure is not sufficient to support such an influx of population. Our school GP surgery facilities for young people etc are not sufficient. Villages such as Cromarty or Kinlochleven have development trusts and / or resources for their communities which we just do not have.

Can you put this infrastructure in place?"

Submission number

S-1-1

Consultee number

N/A

Date

14/01/2026

Comments

Requests: Plenty green belt across the top of the hill so the historic high street houses are not overlooked / retain privacy, nor lose any winter light. Any site for facilities such as a school to be near the existing village and accessible from the village via footpaths and cycle routes. Opposite Fulmar Crescent? A large green belt of no development around Cromal Hill and the Sandy Brae. Streetlights not visible from the old village or shore to try and protect some dark sky. This potentially triples existing traffic. Widen the Old Military 'Gollanfield' Road so vehicles can pass, add a pavement/ cycle track, strengthen the bridges, connect to the A96 with a roundabout. Build the Nairn bypass! Widen the Nairn Road that passes by Ardersier Port to allow 2 way traffic and a cycle path. Maintain the current core paths - the beach one needs repair- and add new ones around the new estate. Stop people buying second homes.