

## SUTHERLAND LOCAL PLAN: HOUSING FEEDBACK COMMENTS

### Housing

**For example: In light of the likely need for housing in your community are there any particular sites you would like to see developed? Do you have a view on the level of need and type of affordable housing required? Can crofting land contribute to meeting the demand for housing?**

General
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is plenty of land for development locally if permission was to be GIVEN!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, you need to see to it that land is made available for house building and small farming. The rest would follow by natural investment and economic development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the new housing is haphazard; spoiling the beautiful rural areas of the country. Unattractive modern boxes. Need for housing for key workers, perhaps subsidised and only allowed to be sold to other key workers, not above the rate of inflation, definitely not to the retired or as second homes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I cannot understand why permission is granted to build new houses when so many houses ripe for renovation are allowed to deteriorate until they are beyond redemption.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop only where there is public waste drainage. It is environmentally unsound to build more and more new houses in crofting areas. Invest in environmentally friendly septic tank solution i.e. enforce the creation of reed beds etc. to clear waste.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New house building to be allowed after planning consent for main house to automatically be allowed to expand for future children i.e. new wing or zone, larger housing in ground. Owners then do not have to have children move away and still allow for offspring independence with open market (see natural and cultural heritage.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No – business brings work. Work brings wealth. Wealth creates housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None whatsoever – Sutherland is the last great wilderness and should be left without yet more houses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I consider that there is no need for further housing. If more houses are built where are the jobs for these people?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly the planning put too many restrictions on people wanting to build houses. Currently the only people who can build are ones who own crofts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep housing compact and avoid the ribbon development of ugly modern bungalows that have spread amongst some of our coastal townships.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see landscape planning requirements stringently enforced.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilise infill sites within existing housing developments.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater adherence to SNH recommendation on maintaining landscape character when designating sites and visual appearance of housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is plenty of derelict/rundown housing that should either be knocked and new builds put up or done up themselves.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not a strong demand for housing local people in the area. Some modest development may be required - but only in the main settlements.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do need to increase our population and skills base – but not by decanting problems from cities – skilled people/Eastern Europeans perhaps. But quality housing which UK and other residents can acquire for less than English house prices coupled with a change in lifestyle, job creation is far better.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is there a likely need for more housing in north Caithness and Sutherland? Dounreay, the largest employer, is predicting considerable job reductions in the next 20 years and there are no firm, realistic plans for an alternative. Perhaps if a new nuclear power plant were to be built at Dounreay a need would arise, but failing that I cannot see why.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manageable housing for elderly.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small first time one/ two bed houses in villages and towns. Limited spaced out houses in rural areas and on crofts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning laws which are sympathetic to vernacular building traditions and which have in-built aesthetic criteria.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have enough housing now!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do need to increase our / the local population and to bring down the average age while developing the local skills base--but not by decanting problems from Scotland's cities---skilled Polish / East European are a better prospect and will bring diversity and a work ethic perhaps lacking at present. But quality housing at reasonable prices which UK and other people in their 30s and 40s with children can acquire for measurably less than central belt and English house prices is a key aspect---something to encourage a lifestyle decision to move to a country environment and bring their skills and entrepreneurial spirit to East Sutherland.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Starter homes, affordable, for local young people is essential and rare. The young and many not so young are priced out of homes in their own home area. We are becoming a country of retired people because of the housing market. Land made available for young local people to build if they can't get a croft.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing is needed in all the townships and villages. There are virtually no available sites either due to the estate owners not releasing land or with draconian planning restrictions as in Dornoch and Brora. The Local Plan should consider the lack of sites and address the problem.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People with holiday homes must be penalised when locals are un-housed (in winter). 2/3/4 Home owner – <u>no</u> homes is a modern scandal.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses will always be needed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use in-fill sites. No to isolated areas – too expensive for public services.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the gaps between existing housing where the main sources of Electricity/Phones exist. A large amount of croft land hasn't got any services close by and we don't want more poles across these areas.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any housing development should be near to facilities, schools, shops etc.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the size of Sutherland and the lack of people I think most housing developments should be encouraged. This would bring new ideas and people into the area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for including us in your plans. Being second home owners, we realise that our opinions are low in priority. We actually cause less impact on the wild environment than people living there and rescued a derelict croft house 24 years ago, renovating it accurately with hand made windows by local joiner est. We have first had to rebuild our barn as it became dangerous and used all the original stone. We do let it when not there but left the Tourist Board years ago when they began adding to the destruction of the Highlands by introducing compulsory star ratings etc. which require tasteless mod cons many people do not want. They have no idea how to 'sell' remote Scotland for holidays. You'll never please everyone so all the best with your efforts! We are appalled at the selling off of crofting land for building. There seems little in the way of any planning required and old barns and cottages can be demolished and replaced by cheap modern kit houses. Grants should be available to renovate these so they are as warm s the new ones but don't spoil the character of the area – probably too late now.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any housing development should be very carefully considered on developments like the Pentland Housing Estate in Thurso, avoided. Modern/contemporary architecture should be encouraged by the authorities, not as it stands, the standard kit house currently in favour in Dornoch.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further housing required especially by incomers pushing up prices.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maintain the unspoilt quality of the district, I believe it would be desirable to avoid the piece-meal development of new housing on crofting land, particularly of the highly unsympathetic modern bungalow type of dwelling, which have so blighted other parts of the Highlands, from a landscape perspective.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sutherland is the jewel in the Nations Crown. Let well alone.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is disappointing to see the development of random strip building on the edge of villages.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pointless to build affordable housing if there are no jobs in the area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel that the local plan should favour first and foremost the redevelopment of existing redundant or derelict properties and sites in the villages into one and two bedroom flats and houses for housing association rental and for sale to people who are going to live in them all year i.e. not for holiday rentals or second homes. The priority should be for affordable homes for local young people, young families and the elderly. Another priority ought to be that all refurbished and new build homes should be obliged to incorporate green technology e.g. solar panels for hot water, small housing schemes should use communal sustainable heating systems (woodchip boilers for example) and</li> </ul>

should consider reed bed or other green technology systems for waste water.

### **Affordable Housing**

- There is an obvious need for affordable. The question is what is “affordable” £50,000 to £100,000.
- Looking at the Population chart which shows we are behind the Highland average in 20-39 age groups, perhaps we should follow the initiative suggested in the Aviemore area – affordable housing for locals to encourage our young people to stay here?
- Good quality affordable houses required to encourage young people to stay in Sutherland and assist first time buyers onto property ladder. Houses should be detached and in keeping with the village (no big estates or terraces.)
- Affordable housing for first time buyers.
- The market decides cost of housing not the Council.
- Electricity needed for affordable housing – prices have become unacceptably high – too many holiday homes!
- There is a need for affordable housing.
- Only affordable housing to buy in area is Council houses. All other houses are sold at too high a price for young people to buy, therefore older, richer people are moving into the area.
- I think there is a need for affordable housing. I understand that some people have difficulty here.
- Great need for housing for young couples.
- I’m told young couples need suitable housing – probably easy access to school and post office.
- Need for affordable housing outwith main population centres. Traditional houses being sold as holiday homes at prices outwith the reach of local people.
- If people require to build on crofting land but also require to live in the village (i.e. Melvich) on a permanent basis, NOT as a holiday home, then this should be looked at seriously.
- Communities need to be sustained and growth encouraged. Affordable homes in accessible areas built in keeping with the local area (i.e. white croft cottages.)
- We need affordable housing for young people and some kind of restriction on the number of holiday homes.!
- We need small properties for rent for local single people and families. Not four bedroom houses that local people cannot afford.
- First time buyers should have top priority.
- I am all in favour of more affordable housing but have no idea where suitable development sites are available, perhaps some of the houses standing vacant/derelict would be a good idea.
- No more sales of Council Houses.
- Better control over houses being used as holiday homes. Keep Council houses for those that really need them.
- Large housing developments should consist predominantly of social housing.
- There should be affordable house for people living in their area, maybe the ruined cottage sites could be made available.
- Affordable housing for young locals.
- It would be good if more outlying places could have affordable housing so that any new business felt there was a local workforce on which to draw BUT there would HAVE to be proper local transport i.e. at least a couple of buses a day to the coast to make that kind of housing attractive.
- We think that affordable sites for people to build themselves would be a good idea, but not for large numbers of rented accommodation, as the job situation will not support people coming in large numbers, also locals should get priority over these sites.
- An affordable housing build should only be sold/let to persons already resident here for a minimum of five years.
- The majority of affordable housing should be set aside for local young people. It is no good building these houses if it is all incomers who buy them. Young people can not afford to buy at the inflated prices now being asked.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing for rent plus affordable property for first time buyers are an essential for any community.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing for retired people with good level access and near to village.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing required for locally based working families.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for housing for young families.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have a view that the provision of land for affordable housing in Sutherland (and in Scotland) can easily be solved. This will require a radical change to housing policy, but one that will actually solve a problem that seems insoluble. The one thing that Scotland and Sutherland have is plenty of land. There are many areas adjacent to existing towns and villages (and in more rural situations) where planning permission will never be granted under current planning laws. This may be forestry land for example. Looking at it from a business point of view, land under trees is worth something like £250 per acre, (because of the requirement to always grow trees). If a land owner was approached and paid say £10,000 per acre, the acquiring body or trust would have plots valued at £2,500 each (4 per acre) instead of the usual £50,000 plus that is being achieved now. The key would be to be selective about the sites chosen, and to be particular about the quality of design, services and infrastructure. It could really work if though through carefully. Everyone would be the winner if a careful formula was followed, and what a coup for Sutherland to be the first area to achieve the impossible.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be more affordable housing for rent and purchase.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Use of Croft Land</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, housing for local young families who wish to own their house but do not have the income to complete.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should be made available if owners wish to sell a small proportion for house sites.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should remain for crofting – there is plenty of other land available. Should be easier to obtain croft land if to protect its use.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land which has a very low use for crofting should be given over to house plots.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe crofting land could contribute quite a bit to housing needs.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not imagine Crofters would want to lose their land, unless they benefited financially. I assume the next generation would want affordable housing if there are jobs. Those not employed would want Council housing, or grants to build on crofts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land shouldn't be a soft option for satisfying housing need. There is plenty of land on common grazing or on private estates without using good quality land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see common grazing land rather than actual crofts being used.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should remain crofting land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should be available to be bought at a reasonable price especially for young and local people. Too many crofters are making a fortune only because their crofts happen to be in beauty spots.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No way – there is very limited grazing for crofters as it is.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes – seeing more housing out in the rural crofting areas is healthy for our community as the crofters are mainly ageing people who do not wish to leave their homes. But we enjoy having young people around; need young people too.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land can contribute to housing providing it is purchased at building land value and not croft land value.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see renovation of existing croft houses rather than new build on adjacent green field sites.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a croft owner myself I would like to see land that is of NO use to me more easily de-crofted and less red tape.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land to be retained in families only as formerly.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the local Council can negotiate a deal with any interested crofters, then why not?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absolutely no to crofting land being used for housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should not be used for housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop building on crofts and use common grazing land, as building on crofts is killing crofting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't build on good agricultural land.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, croft land can contribute demand to meeting the need for housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should be left to crofters – support community buy-outs of absentee owned land by suitably constituted bodies (companies limited by guarantee.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All other areas should be explored before croft land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not too much spreading into crofts please. But easier for family to get planning on their own land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far too much land in the hands of powerful Grazings Committees! So much land and none available. Too many second (holiday) homes allowed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Croft land should not be used for housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land could contribute.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extreme caution should be exercised in developing croft land. ‘Agricultural requirements’ should not circumvent planning constraints and should be demonstrably genuine.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any new housing sites should be kept close to existing large settlements or on former industrial sites, not spread out over crofting land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing priority for local first time homes and for elderly to retire to and release croft house for next generation. Croft land can contribute but not to the detriment of being an agricultural unit.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think there are huge opportunities for the provision of housing on croft land in Sutherland. We own crofts that flank the southern shores of Dornoch Firth and Kyle of Sutherland. Whilst most crofters are considering buying their crofts, it is evident that there are many ruined dwellings that could be brought back into useful housing stock. I would happily expand on this topic in our future discussions.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should be left for crofting, more people should be able to get into crofting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should not be used to develop large scale housing. Crofting should be the main use of crofting land. Any development should be as close to urban development as possible and not in the rural areas. Holiday homes should not be encouraged.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am against using crofting land for general housing use unless it already lies within the village confines. The kind of creeping ribbon development and suburbanisation of the countryside which is currently happening at the north end of Brora at the Dalchalm junction and outside Dornoch on the Embo road for example, is very unsightly and gives a very poor impression of our communities attitude to our magnificent natural surroundings. The look of the landscape is so important for all tourism related development. Planning for single houses on crofting land should continue to be given ONLY if the prospective home owner can prove that they will be working the land in some way, and only if the land in question has no housing already on it. Refurbishing and extending existing traditional houses should be encouraged over new builds wherever possible and new houses in crofting landscapes should reflect traditional forms and should be sensitively sited.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Ardgay area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think there must be a raised need for housing in the area- Ardgay is blessed with such beautiful surroundings. I think there is crofting land that could possibly help.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing in Ardgay is urgently required for young local people / families.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More council houses required for Ardgay.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing is required in Ardgay and as a young local person I have enclosed 3 maps to show this. Ardgay itself – marked red. South-east of Ardgay – yellow. Lower Gledfield - orange. I would like to highlight that all these areas have been picked to try and make the impact on surrounding areas as reduced as possible. I would also suggest a degree of traditional design is kept to fit in with oldest areas of Ardgay.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An area of land between Gledfield School and Church Street, Lower Gledfield/Ardgay Hill. Crofting land should be in use/ neglected or unused land could be made available for housing for young people at affordable prices. Another site would be the play park at Carron Place now redundant.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urgent need for affordable housing for young people on low incomes. Crofting land can contribute a proportion to meet this demand.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you allow windmills in an area then landscape should no longer be a planning consideration for any development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No flats please anywhere. Totally unacceptable in rural areas. Disabled facilities inadequate i.e. pavement adjustments. Surely cash can be found for this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to use our land and our housing plots. We have been told by the planning office that it is earmarked as an industrial site. We disagree. This land lies to the SE of our property just outside the 30 mile limit leaving Ardgay.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing is needed for families to move into and stay in the area. Priority to local people and increased charges for 2<sup>nd</sup> homes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 identical comments on Para. 4.1 of Background Paper - "Settlement boundaries": As one nearby example; at Ardgay 40 houses could be built within the current plan. In the recent past, 8 houses have been built or permission for given in the area near Ardgay. One (1) house is in the planned envelope. 88% are outside. 88% of my effort at the last local plan drafting stage, 88% of your effort and 88% of the cost of that exercise was wasted. The proposal is to widen envelopes. Why? Why have a plan which wastes 88% of its cost. Widening envelopes will not stop applications lying wherever a builder wishes their house to lie. Hear these applications on their merit. Would that be a free-for-all? It would mirror what we have now.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Bettyhill area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rental properties for young families, to slow the drain of such families to Thurso area or even further away.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, I would like to see more houses being built – there is a great shortage of houses here.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are ex croft houses going to wrack and ruin. Couldn't they be renovated?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a major shortage of affordable housing and / or building land. Infill area should be extended to include Farr and Crask.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing for old and vulnerable people is required – especially for one to two person households. So one/two bedroomed housing rather than three/four bedrooms. Using crofting land is unacceptable. This is a declining resource that should be for all and not 'given' away to right to buy tenants.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achnabourin Estate: There is a need for affordable housing and I am willing to make crofted land available for housing if the crofters agree. One of my companies is involved in the provision of timber kits for affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no need for housing in Strathnaver as there are already a number of unoccupied houses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current 'preferred planning zones' around Bettyhill are severely limiting the availability of potential housing sites in and around the village despite there being a great deal of open land on the in-bye common grazing that could be made available for house sites. The grazing committee have received a significant number of enquiries from families wishing to obtain a house in, or around, Bettyhill, some of which we have regrettably had to refuse due to the shortage of available sites that were with-in the acceptable zones. There is a potential need for sites for single craftsmen workshops, cottage industry should be encouraged. Currently only crofting tenants have much hope of having such premises in Bettyhill. There needs to be further consultation on this issue involving both the grazing committee and the Bettyhill community council. A personal view would be to zone more non-arable areas and to discourage development on arable and potentially arable croft land. As you will be aware our communities are disadvantaged in many ways, but that a growing community is more likely to be a viable community than one that is stagnant or declining. There appears to be a will for development in and around Bettyhill and that could only be of benefit to our community.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for a small amount of new housing to provide for people who are already in the community and wish to stay due to their employment. I would not welcome new housing for the incoming from the south to be here on benefits. That is not the way to go.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a parent of a young family in Bettyhill I am acutely aware of the need for affordable housing and I am aware of several other families with at least 2 young children of pre-school and nursery age in the same situation as ourselves who are in unsuitable rented accommodation. This accommodation is of a good enough standard but on our part is very small which is the case for at least one other family and another family are in an area well outwith the village which is not ideal in a social context for children. I would like to see any sites in the village of Bettyhill itself developed. There is land next to Mackenzie Crescent which currently has two disused county buildings (storage?) and wasteland which I believe would offer an excellent site for affordable housing or council rentals. There are also several small pockets of common grazings land which are not used to graze sheep on which could be developed. Debate in Bettyhill seems to be too centred around parking for the school when those doing the debating should consider the bigger picture in that there will not be a school if housing is not provided for young families. I believe our families are just looking for simple no frills decent sized housing with at least 3 bedrooms and ample room for living and dining. There seems to be little existing council housing stock with 3 bedrooms. (3 of which are occupied by single people!)</li> </ul>

<p><b>Bonar Bridge area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bonar Bridge needs more private housing to redress the balance. Land above Cherry Grove and East of Carnegie Court is obvious area for development.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land parallel with doctor's surgery.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing in Bonar is urgently required for young local people / families.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think that there is a need for more affordable housing in the area and there are suitable rural crofting areas for development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More council houses required for Bonar.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My croft at Tulloch, Bonar Bridge should be developed for housing or business use as it is of no use for crofting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bonar Bridge needs affordable housing both for families and single people.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land on either side of Cherry Grove. Land above Swordale Crescent and below Matheson Road. Land behind Kyle House and Church of Scotland Manse. Swordale Farm Land at extreme end of village on road to Dornoch. Crofting land should also be utilised where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land can contribute but I wouldn't like to see the crofts over developed with house sites. Especially not on the better land. Perhaps common grazings could help.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield village sites exist which should be developed instead of allowing unrestricted spread over the countryside. Croft land can contribute, but proposals need much more careful scrutiny. Migdale, a beautiful ancient crafting area, is being spoilt by unnecessary and greedy development, whilst old houses which could be renovated remain empty elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of land currently included in Local Plan in immediate vicinity of Cherry Grove, can provide sufficient public/private house sites for foreseeable future.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No use of arable land – too much used already – in this unsettled world we don't know what the future holds – we may have to feed ourselves. Also woodland areas could be exempt from building sites. Possibly small private housing for older buyers with communal gardens and adequate parking/garage facilities for singles or couples without family in pre-care era. Or for professionals returning to native area. Part ownership scheme? Also shelter housing for all age groups.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not agricultural land. Use village infill or low grade hill land for housing.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Brora area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brora Mill Site – Housing affordable to 1<sup>st</sup> time buyers.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confine expansion to the village.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much clearer RQD on areas of high value and council type housing. May be too late for Brora.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to see the old mill site developed with an emphasis on one and two bedroom households. The Fascally recreation area is too far out of the village and is not well used. It would make a good site for two and three bedroom family homes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site of the previous Woollen Mill.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of private housing outside the village area to sites where people would prefer to live. Crofting land at Dalchalm.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel that there is a moderate need for affordable housing and Council rented accommodation for permanent residents only, in my ward. Brora has just seen the development of a hotel into luxury apartments. The way forward should benefit those of us who permanently live and work here. I would not want to see crofting land meeting the demand for housing. I feel crofting should be maintained.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Hunter's Woollen Mill Site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the 'old mill' site is hopefully to be housing and Muirfield Road/Drive relatively easily expandable I think that is sufficient, what is badly needed is a decent play park and somewhere for teenagers to go to – i.e. a youth café/club with games/music etc. Crofting land use only as a last resort!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vast area to the west of the village of Brora is currently blighted by 33 year old Brora bypass. Already discussed this on site with planning reps. What is affordable housing? Even the name indicates a lower standard. Croft land could contribute – the difficulty is releasing it from croft legislation!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Mill Site, Radio Station, Infill.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review current plan on where housing can be developed. If an area can be developed keep an open mind.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the Old Mill Site, Victoria Road. Single Storey houses. Permission be given to crofters to make land available irrespective of whether or not the site is for member of crofter's family.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I hope the Wool Mill site goes ahead and the need everywhere is for affordable housing for young couples. Every house on the market is bought up by incoming elderly people.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doll: When I moved here nearly 15 years ago, I looked out of my window to see croft land and the sea. Now all I see are houses and agricultural buildings. The whole area is being spoilt and I think more development will be a real turn off for tourists.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Clyne: I think that this answer covers everything. I have been here 45 years and there was going to be sewage put in then. How can you build any houses until you have done the necessary things that include building property, business or homes or any other thing without sewage.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would not like to see further housing development. This is a Highland village which is the most important point about it, anyway why the need, if so many are supposedly leaving?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, develop West Clyne and Achrimsdale. Two bedroom houses and flats. Too many private houses going up there.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting agricultural land is always lost and never gained. It should be protected. There appears to be sufficient non-agricultural land available for housing or other developments. E.g. The old Wool Mill site in Brora should be developed for local affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste / derelict land within the village confines should be earmarked for housing to improve the appearance of the village as a whole, but I strongly object to development of (housing or industrial units) on places of national beauty i.e. coast lines and open fields. I very definitely object to croft land being sold for Housing Development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not feel that crofting land should be used for housing, but development should be kept within the towns.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brown field sites ought to be used both for private and public housing. Care should be taken to avoid ribbon development. There are already signs of such development occurring at Dalchalm. It is important to maintain a largely unbroken skyline otherwise there will be an urban/village sprawl!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More council housing for rent required Victoria Road. Lower Brora by Radio Station site dependant on proper roads could be developed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wool Mill Site – Crofting land earmarked at Ben Mailey Gardens. % of second homes is quite worrying. Lack of affordable housing for locals and the Council's replenishable stock is falling.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No – residential home for the elderly on the site of the old mill.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hunters Old Mill Yard in Brora. Preferably not more private housing as these can only be bought by incomers, the vast majority of whom are retired. More Council houses – rentable, not buyable. An obvious need for elderly people – a nursing or residential home.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Mill Site Brora – priority given to development of 'brownfield' sites.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe Brora would benefit from building 'Starter' homes at affordable prices for young couples who may be employed in retail and hotel and catering industries paying national minimum wages.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outlying villages developed to stop them becoming holiday home ghettos, crofting land made available to all and certainly more checks made on absent tenants before allowing building.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning protections contained within the existing South and East Sutherland Local Plan and in the Highland Council's Structure Plan Policies G2(Design for Sustainability) and H3 (Housing in the Countryside) should be carried forward into and strengthened by the proposed Sutherland Local Plan. The existing stock of crofted land must be protected. There is constant pressure to de-croft protected land for speculative housing development. Brora is presently a 'hotspot' for expensive and intensive speculative housing development providing accommodation apparently aimed at second home or investment buyers. This cannot help local housing needs. The recently completed Links Hotel development and the proposed multi-apartment scheme at Carroll house, Golf Road are prime examples. The current former Hunters Mill site housing development will provide for the vast majority of housing needs in the immediate Brora area for the foreseeable future. Dalchalm is under constant and sustained pressure from speculative housing development. Within the last year five new domestic properties have been built, by no means all of which are to be occupied as family homes. This is in a hamlet of perhaps no more than fifty domestic properties. There is already a more than sufficient stock of second homes, holiday letting units or perfectly adequate but unoccupied domestic properties within Dalchalm without further speculative development. Further speculative housing development along the A9 corridor in the North Brora area generally and Dalchalm specifically should be strongly resisted. A positive planning policy presuming against such development should be included in the new Sutherland Local Plan.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please find enclosed map for reference to letter from planning office. I would like this area of Brora (South of Academy Street) to be included in the new local plan for</li> </ul>



housing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brora old mill site, land at ex radio station, Lower Brora, Council owned land at east Brora Muir. Good crofting land is fully utilised for that purpose and should not be sacrificed for housing for the retired affluent ex home owners from the south.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Former radio station at Brora links could be used for housing or a retirement home.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheltered housing with communal facilities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wool mill site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no need for affordable housing. Croft land development should be allowed, but a maximum of 1 site per croft.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe crofting land of under 1 acre, when it's a separate lot, should be made available for housing, given the acute shortage, and that this should override the Crofters Commission. It seems daft for some houses and land to be partly crofted and partly de-crofted.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More unused crofting land should be available for housing. Housing shared ownership schemes should be developed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally I hope that provision will be made for first-time buyers by any private developers. Local authorities should provide housing for all age groups. Wholesale crofting land shouldn't be used for housing schemes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many people have asked me for a house site. I have land but cannot get planning permission due to the land being outwith the local planning zone. I believe that local croft land should be used for housing if the demand justifies it.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are several sites in Brora which could provide a substantial number of homes without taking more croft land from the edge of town. The railway station and its environs would be particularly suitable for renovated and new build units for the elderly as they are so close to all the village amenities. There is a lot of space around the New Hunter's Mill site which could also be built on without affecting whatever will eventually happen to the site ..again this site is close to the school and village amenities. Knox's Corner at the far north end of the village ought to be redeveloped. It is a listed building and its current owners ought to be prevailed upon to either turn it into affordable homes for local people themselves or sell it on to someone who will do something to the benefit of the village with it. Fascally recreation site is very under used, perhaps the top section of the site, where the Heritage Centre currently is would make a good site for some new homes - again within the current boundaries of the village.</li> </ul>

<b>Dornoch area</b>
There are already enough houses in Dornoch. The town will be spoiled if any more are built. The school doesn't have enough teachers. The doctors surgery is always too busy. A9 is too busy. Why build more houses. We are even closing the Police Station. People can live elsewhere.
Retirement homes, private and Council run. Dornoch area has a higher proportion of elderly, and a lot of older people on their own would benefit from these and they would be central to the town to all the older group to maintain independence.
Some affordable housing is required but <u>not</u> on the level which is currently being planned. Dornoch is in danger of becoming too big, which will destroy the very qualities which attract residents and tourists to the town. Car parking is difficult, especially at the tourist season. Roads/services will be hard put to cope with the increase in population. Petty crime/vandalism will also increase.
Lonemore; the old railway line to Embo and beyond.
Whilst I understand the need for affordable housing for first time buyers, I cannot understand why there are 200 houses planned for Dornoch, when there is no work for the potential buyers and no suitable road for the extra traffic. These houses will therefore be bought by outsiders as holiday homes or by rich locals, looking to make a quick profit – like the developers.
The Meadows.
Definitely need 3-4 bedroom houses in Dornoch.
The town should double in size to sustain schools and much required leisure facilities. No building should be allowed of any kind on Dornoch links on common good land. Housing in the countryside should be for agricultural purposes but a new village at Skelbo might be an idea and expansion of Spinningdale School be considered.
I would like to see Evelix or Lonemore further developed as they are close lying to Dornoch. The need is for affordable housing for newly (local) married couples and for young professionals wanting to return to the area. It is not advisable to destroy rural areas.

There is plenty of land on the way to Cuthill. Crofting land is not required.
Develop a site of affordable housing on the south side of the A949 East of Drumdivan.
Rough ground behind Stafford Court / Earls Cross Road – just an eyesore at present.
I would like to see the area of Proncy developed. There is a need for affordable housing for the local population not mini England. Crofting land should not be plundered for housing, as is the custom for economic greed. Please enforce a local plan that will restrict development to Dornoch town and periphery.
We do need more affordable housing in Balvraid. Crofting land could contribute to this. But they are all areas in Dornoch. There are two unused or partly used industrial sites where less expensive houses could be located.
Not one large area for housing several sites with mixed size housing. Do not build on flood plain areas. Good building sites on the Poles Road, improve access onto A9.
It is important that Dornoch does not lose its unique appeal in the drive to increase housing. I am strongly against any development to the south of the Lonemore road and to the south of the centre of Dornoch. The area lies in close proximity to the boundary of the Dornoch Firth, a SSSI noted for its range of coastal habitats and any contaminated surface water entering the Dornoch Firth could have significant detrimental effects. It is also a highly visible area and any development would considerably alter the landscape character from dune links to town housing in what is a National Scenic Area. The recent proposal to develop around the football and games area would also result in a serious downgrading of quality of one of the main public amenities in Dornoch. For some of the above reasons I would not like to see any more development south of the A949. One of the great attractions of Dornoch is to see the open area to the south on coming into the town. Further, I would not like to see any more destruction of the moraine that crosses the A949 as it is a fine example of this particular geological feature. So to me the area I think should be developed, for housing and business/ industrial, is to the north of Dornoch between the B9168 and the Embo road. It is south facing, not visually obtrusive and has no need for any SUDS type drainage systems. Some (25%?) new housing should be affordable for local under 25 year olds. Crofting land should be preserved. Any sports centre should be around the schools.
Land to the North of the town could be used for building, no ground to the south of west, due to the disruption of the scenic approach to the town and the low lying nature of this area. I do not agree that crofting land should be used for housing, this is a very unique farming structure which should not be interrupted.
Crofts in close proximity certainly, but outlying crofts could be able to sell a few plots. Being a crofter (27 acres) the crofts would have to be carefully selected but I do believe people are more important than a view or protected trees etc.
Please listen to what people are saying. You estimate 107 people waiting for housing in the Dornoch Ward! The houses or Council houses that have been built in the last 25 years seem to have been sold at cut prices to people living in them. Hence your claim now to be wanting new houses. The private houses are far too costly for ordinary work folk. It is not everyone who can afford to play golf at Skibo. Like the people whom houses are being built for now. Crofting land up Evelix Valley where at one time there were lots of homes before Clunie Crescent at Dornoch and Calder Crescent at Embo-were supposed to have been for the elderly. That is no longer the case.
There is a clear need for affordable housing in the area. Many 18-40 year olds have no option other than to stay with their parents or move away. Crofting areas should be used for crofting, not to ease the housing problem in the town of Dornoch. It is a myth that there is a shortage of land for affordable housing as fine well the Highland Council knows.
Dornoch town is quite big enough and any further developments should be small scale and outwith the town. Massive developments such as proposed for the Meadows/Sutherland Road of 100+ houses are quite out of scale and would wreck the gem of Dornoch Town. The extra traffic and demand for amenities in such a small concentrated area are quite unacceptable. Outlying settlements should be restricted to 10-12 houses and bespoke, not speculative.
At present arrangements are being made for houses to be built at Dornoch.
There is a very high need for affordable housing in Dornoch as the amount of holiday homes bought up in this area is terrible. They lie empty for most of the time then when the golfing season starts they are used for about 6 to 10 weeks of the year. I also think crofting land can help out if done properly.
It must enhance the area and what makes Dornoch attractive and viable.
More affordable housing for young people. Site at Poles Road. Unwise to build any housing on the Meadows Flood Plain (Future Global Warming Threat) and access.
I know there is a great need for affordable housing in Dornoch. The sites I would like to see developed are the fields at Achinchanter also the fields immediately west of the Academy.
Sites – Bishopfield area of Dornoch and link Camore with Dornoch Academy as opposed to current proposals of building on lower levels such as Sutherland Road and Meadows. Type – property price explosion has greatly hindered opportunities for the young and those on limited budget. Needs to be addressed. Property to be in keeping with existing styles, but with encouragement to renewable and energy efficient builds.

I am not familiar with the area. I am sure there is a need for new housing but I do like the quietness of Dornoch. If new housing is needed then of course there has to be somewhere for young children and teenagers to go.
Starter/affordable houses definitely a requirement.
There are a considerable number of gap sites not being utilised by their current owners in and on the periphery of the town. Crofting land should not be used.
More housing is required to allow the local businesses to attract new staff and for continued growth of the area. There are far too many holiday homes.
1. Fourpenny, Lonemore. 2. No. Insufficient knowledge of requirements.3. Unable to comment through lack of knowledge.
It is important that Dornoch does not lose its unique appeal in the drive to increase housing. I am strongly against any development to the south of the Lonemore road and to the south of the centre of Dornoch. The area lies in close proximity to the boundary of the Dornoch Firth, a SSSI noted for its range of coastal habitats and any contaminated surface water entering the Dornoch Firth could have significant detrimental effects. It is also a highly visible area and any development would considerably alter the landscape character from dune links to town housing in what is a National Scenic Area. The recent proposal to develop around the football and games area would also result in a serious downgrading of quality of one of the main public amenities in Dornoch. For some of the above reasons I would not like to see any more development south of the A949. One of the great attractions of Dornoch is to see the open area to the south on coming into the town. Further, I would not like to see any more destruction of the moraine that crosses the A949 as it is a fine example of this particular geological feature. So to me the area I think should be developed, for housing and business/ industrial, is to the north of Dornoch between the B9168 and the Embo road. It is south facing, not visually obtrusive and has no need for any SUDS type drainage systems. Some (25%?) new housing should be affordable for local under 25 year olds. Crofting land should be preserved.
Land to the North of the town could be used for building, no ground to the south of west, due to the disruption of the scenic approach to the town and the low lying nature of this area. I do not agree that crofting land should be used for housing, this is a very unique farming structure which should not be interrupted.
Affordable housing for young folk and first-time buyers is needed but excessive housing development for the upper-income bracket persons will destroy the already threatened ambiance of the Dornoch area.
I recognise there is a certain need for affordable housing in the Dornoch area. Any proposed site for development, or crofting land, should be considered individually on its suitability or potential, taking in all aspects, by the planning authority. The Poundbury Village development is certainly a good example recently discussed by you.
No expansion of present areas zoned for housing in Dornoch. Maintain present 'green belt' around Dornoch. Meet future housing need by expanding small neighbouring communities e.g. Camore-Embo to allow them to expand to a more viable size.
No, crofting land cannot be used to help meet demand for housing. Continued development is destroying the character of Dornoch. However it seems unstoppable and therefore further building must be extension of suburban areas already there. The 'Rowan Avenue' estate continued up Poles road and over to the Embo road is the obvious site. Local authority housing seems only possible in the area immediately up the Embo road and behind the old Earls Cross Hostel.
Definitely not – there are far too many houses being built in the country, and out-of-character houses the norm. Birchen is especially being over-housed and it is time a stop was put to ribbon development as it is at the top of Rearquhar and Skelbo Street. Tree cutting is another aspect which should be looked into and preservation orders put on vulnerable woodlands which border on likely sites of development. Poles road is an absolute disgrace after nothing but vandalism on two nice groups of trees. Develop down in the waste lands on the low road adjacent to the meadows and keep all the eyesore out of the country. There are so many houses up Rearquhar now that it is an absolute pest going in and out passing places when one makes a journey any time the 2 miles from our house to the A9 during the day or night. As for moving sheep, it is a nightmare at any time of the day, taking twice as long as it did 10 years ago. More council houses round Dornoch should be built in order to keep our young people in the area, or else affordable housing.
Low cost housing only required in Dornoch so young families can settle and raise children. Crofting land availability would help.
One of the reasons that people desire to come to Dornoch is because the town is well kept and presented, and representative of Sutherland's county town. It has a cathedral, old gaol tastefully reused, It has telephone boxes with glass and phones that work. In summer the tourists flock to Dornoch because of it's natural assets, golf course, lovely beach. It would be wrong to place, develop, build any housing other than in fill sites on existing plots to match existing dwellings. Do not develop Dornoch any more in spite of the need for housing otherwise you end up with problems of antisocial behaviour, high density housing, social problems. It has agricultural land and areas of outstanding natural beauty – keep it that way.
Camore could be developed further. Mixed rented and owned housing like Burgh Gardens would be good. Perhaps some croftland near the town could be used.
Dornoch needs more low cost housing for young people to get a foot on the property ladder. What we do not need are more houses which then become second or holiday houses.
There already seems to be an un-met need for affordable housing in the ward, and ever increasing numbers of holiday homes. I would certainly like to see the expansion of the

permanently resident population of Dornoch, and a diminution of the proportion of part-time occupants. The Highland Council should campaign for changes in legislation and VAT to encourage more energy efficiency in homes and halt the dilapidation of existing buildings. Economic expansion should be encouraged, so that more people can work here.
More land should be made available on the outskirts of Dornoch. Planners should be more sympathetic towards the needs of first time buyers. A percentage of houses should be forced to use renewable energy systems with localised financial help given as encouragement.
Demand for housing in Birchen and Skelbo areas. Development at Rearquhar. Croft land can continue.
Housing should continue to be encouraged as part of the earlier plan, including the Embo/Dornoch relief road. If this is not done every developer will think he/she can ignore the plan and the result will be sprinkled 'sites' almost everywhere. I suggest that all development in the anticipated 2050 flood plain be forbidden – Meadows etc.
What is the demand for housing? Affordable rented housing should be available to avoid the spiralling property price situation. Stop 'right to buy' and build public sector housing. Crofting land is affected by legislation I do not know about.
No crofting land should be given planning consent for housing with one exception this would be for younger members of the family to croft. Otherwise we are in danger of losing our unique crofting hamlets.
I think there is a need for houses that young people could rent.
Clashmore: Something should be done with regard to holiday homes for the exclusive use of the owners already 20% of the houses in the village are holiday homes.
Birichen: Affordable housing should be made available to local families and those employed in the area. Housing on croft land should be made available / retained for crofting families in order for the crofting tradition to continue.
One and two bedroom houses for the elderly of a much higher standard than the council houses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First I wish to commend the Council for inviting comments from those actually living in the area. The documentation provided starts with the issue of housing, whereas surely the important starting point is to first ask what the current residents want the area to be. E.G.. Is it to be a farming community? A beautiful area for holidays and retirement? A centre of excellence for golf? A manufacturing centre? A centre for attracting IT skills? What are the aspirations of the area? It is only when this is known then the 'deliverables' necessary to support it (or them) can be investigated. Why start with housing? Who are these houses for? Where are the jobs for these people? The sheet showing several statistics for the area I found to be quite interesting though I doubt if anyone living here would recognise the figures on Employment/Unemployment. The reality is that the area suffers from high unemployment. There are just too few <u>real</u> jobs around and many people chasing any vacancies which occur. So again one asks why start with housing when there are few jobs for current residents? Economic development should be the main focus to support the aspirations of existing residents. The Plan should focus on the activities necessary to deliver this economic development. Once this is established then the skills/training for the area can be defined, followed by the support for private investment to create the jobs and then and only then the housing and social needs for those people. Without new private sector jobs the Council, by focusing on housing, will initiate the economic decline of the area by creating more estates of unemployed people. We all know the effect on communities of such housing areas, just look at Brora or Alness and the high levels of crime they enjoy. A few months ago our local Councillor was promoting the development of 250 'affordable family' houses in Dornoch. No consideration was given to where these 1,000 plus people would work! In the 'real' world people move to where they can get employment and develop their careers, not because there is housing. <u>Housing follows employment</u>. So I suggest the Plan should:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Start with the question for residents on what they want the area to be?</li> <li>2. Develop the economic plan to deliver it.</li> <li>3. Sort out skills/training</li> <li>4. Encourage private investment for new real businesses/jobs.</li> <li>5. Qualify/develop the housing and social needs.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The actual amount of housing development in and around Dornoch during the eight years I have lived here has been quite substantial. Dornoch is noted for its beauty and its income is generated largely by tourism. Tourists come to Dornoch because it is unique both for its historic architecture and its scenic beauty, but there is a danger to it becoming a sprawling urbanisation. Therefore, I suggest that houses should only be built to cater for existing needs and not to satisfy developer's greed. From Table 2 in the Housing background paper, existing specific allocations for Dornoch is 380 for 2005-2017, giving a surplus of 150 houses. Golspie also has a surplus of 97, Bonar 58 etc. To me, as a layman looking at the table, it is indicating that Dornoch as well as others, has been over allocated for housing needs and the allocations should be adjusted.</li> </ul>

The only housing that should be considered during the next 10 years is affordable housing such as council rented and LCH. Any developments built during this time, in the case of Dornoch, should only be of the amount required i.e. 230. One major problem with affordable housing integrated in developments of higher priced housing is that when a property of that status is sold on, it generally loses the 'affordable' status and attracts a price in keeping with the surrounding properties, which defeats the issue of having LCH. Therefore, I think for that reason, affordable properties shouldn't be integrated with higher priced properties, thus keeping them for the needs of the younger people of Sutherland and alleviating the problem of them being purchased by people just wanting a second home. (An increasing problem in Dornoch). I do agree that there should be specific guidance included in the Local Plan on siting and design. Some structures that have been built during the last 30 years in this area are a disgrace to their surroundings. Houses in particular have been bereft of any design in keeping with their surroundings. In fact, a tourist spoke to me only this summer, and was aghast at the amount of the new single storey harled dwellings we had in the area, totally out of character and in his words, 'a blot on the landscape'. It turned out he was a retired architect and currently worked part-time in a planning office in a Scottish county further south. His opinion should be noted. The infrastructure in Sutherland is a cause for concern. I live in a cottage which is served by an old cast iron water main which should have been replaced years ago. Periodically I get rust and sludge coming through my taps. Scottish Water have no plans to replace this cast iron pipe, or even line it. They have only agreed to flush it through every 6 weeks to try and keep it clear. This is 2005 - do you not think existing residents' water supply should be sorted before ever contemplating building more houses and putting even more strain on the water supplies in Dornoch? I think more investment is needed by Scottish Water to improve existing supplies before building more houses. I am sure I am not the only resident in the Dornoch area that has problems with their water supply. I note also that off-site sewer improvement works are needed in Dornoch - again this needs to be resolved before any more building takes place.

- I feel that it is important to provide low cost housing for local people that would not be available to people who did not already live in the area and could not be sold on as holiday homes etc. Crofting land could be a useful resource for housing as I don't believe that the majority of crofting land is crofted in a sustainable manner.

- I consider that there is an acute housing shortage in Dornoch - both for market and affordable housing. One of the priorities for the new Plan should be how to address and meet housing need and demand during the Plan period. A detailed housing capacity study should be carried out which examines where and when new housing should be provided in relation to forecast demand. I would suggest that, following the principles of sustainable development, 'infill' sites within the built envelope of Dornoch should be studied for development potential prior to any 'greenfield' sites on the edge of Dornoch being allocated for housing. This would also help constrain any urban sprawl of the town. Appropriate criteria-based policies should be included in the new Plan to help bring forward development on suitable sites for housing within the existing built up area of Dornoch but to avoid over development or inappropriate development on particular sites.

- We understand the current Local Plan allocates sufficient land for housing development to meet current and projected needs. However, noting the current Local Plan was adopted in May 2000, we would ask that the Council re-assess the suitability of our land for development in preparing the Replacement Plan. The area of land within our ownership that we would propose to develop for housing is outlined in green on attached plan of Evelix Farm. We feel our land may be suitable for both short-term and longer-term development. We believe there is an opportunity for a very small scale, low-density development close to the existing settlement of Camore. Existing land available for development is located in the north side of Dornoch, so by opening up a very small area in the west of the village this would provide much greater choice and flexibility for development. We are supportive of low cost housing and if the area was zoned for housing we would be willing to prepare a comprehensive phased development plan for the site. In making your assessments we would ask you to take into account the following points:
  1. Attractive location, which, with suitable planting and landscaping to the west, would offer appealing sites opposite an existing settlement and near to Dornoch.
  2. Adjacent to the A949 road, offering quick access to both Dornoch and the A9.
  3. Near to the school in Dornoch.
  4. Free draining soil, underlain by sands and gravels. We believe the development of a surface water drainage system in line with SUDS recommendations would be easily achievable.
  5. Electricity, telephone and water all adjacent to the site.
  6. Due to the undulating topography, the field is of limited agricultural use, being wholly used for grazing.
  7. The site is at an elevation of approximately 25m AOD, which will provide adequate head to enable foul water flow to the treatment works. Should the treatment works be at capacity, the free draining nature of the ground would ensure that septic tanks with soakaways would function correctly.
    - We hope that The Highland Council will give consideration to our proposals with a view to zoning the field as suitable for housing development within the next Local Plan for Sutherland.

<b>Durness area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maybe some houses put up in Durness for elderly.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land identified for housing needs to be easily available for sale both to the Housing Associations and private concerns. Crofting land is also very often the best building land – decrofting for building needs to be made easier.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rispond: due to crofting and facilities there is a shortage of available land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer to the local shops and post offices easier for the older generation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofters should give up their land for younger people to build affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More Council housing provision and/or special housing association houses are required. The existing Albyn Housing project has been very good. I think underused crofting land could be allocated.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) To North side of main road opposite Village Hall. b) 10mixed and 2/3 bed. c) No need.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As chairman of Durness Community Council I have recently been involved in identifying suitable areas for housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laid: We have many enquiries in Laid for people who would like to buy a house but there are not many opportunities for doing so. In the plan provision should be made for new housing and the most obvious place for this is the land below the road (i.e. between Loch Eriboll and the road) to the South of the Village. This is crofting land which could and should be used for housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing housing often run-down and un-insulated, help with upgrading these would be welcome, rather than adding to the stock per se. Increased need for additional accommodation for the elderly –sheltered housing. Discourage holiday home ownership.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laid: Not sure how much demand for housing there is, but I feel strongly that any buildings should be of a traditional or appropriate style. We have enough Kit house bungalows that are not adding to the attractiveness of the area, how about encouraging more industrial building, e.g. Lotte Globbs House of Laid or more traditional styles, e.g. croft house styles.</li> </ul>

<b>Elphin area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentive to present landowners to release 1/2-1 acre plots for ecological, sustainable building land use (now desirable). Also 5 acre plots in same way. Elphin our area, is 20 mins from Ullapool and likely to be considered attractive to many working/utilising local town, Ullapool and rural surrounds. Rented accommodation is needed, at reasonable rates. Neat terrace blocks?</li> </ul>

<b>Edderton area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would prefer any new building to be kept to a minimum so as not to spoil the ‘village’ atmosphere.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure needed from Highland Council to press Scottish Water for the Edderton Sewerage upgrade. This would enable the proposed housing to go ahead.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New houses are needed but they must not be sited so that they destroy the character of village and countryside. The area for future village housing should be on the scrub land between the railway and the road to the Railway Station and there they should follow the present pattern of small groups of houses. These houses should be built at a rate of two or three each year or every second year. A large modern housing complex set into the Stony Field would completely destroy the character of the village. It would also destroy an arable field and the site of the Battle of Carrie Blair. In rural Edderton there must be scope for re-building on the ruins of some of the old croft sites and for the formation of new crofts based on forestry.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Affordable developments in towns and villages only. 2. Affordable housing only when a clear established local need with principle of owner/occupier rather than renting. 3. De-Crofting of land only where it supports crofting principle. 4. Avoid urbanisation of countryside.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As far as Edderton itself is concerned, we would like to see a more flexible approach to the designation of tracts for particular purposes to allow a more traditional village plan with its better integration of business and housing.</li> </ul>

<b>Embo area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Back Park.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area set out in the Local Plan already agreed some of which should be low cost for local young couples.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'd like to see the forecast of population natural growth as opposed to immigration and match this to affordable housing for local young people.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I can remember the last local plan of the early 90's - can you tell me please if the outline planning for land identified for development in that plan is now irrelevant with the passage of time? I am thinking in particular about the field bordering the village of Embo that is part of Coul Farm. It would be very useful hypothetically, I would suppose, for any hypothetical community body interested in a hypothetical community buy-out of that farm if the planning consent had indeed lapsed and it was just an ordinary agricultural field again?</li> </ul>

<b>Golspie area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not qualified to comment, except to ask if the blaize field could be used for this or some other purpose.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Golspie bypass could open up land for housing development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estate to release ground for private and affordable housing in the near future.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Backies area. More affordable houses are needed in the area for young people leaving home and wishing to set up their own home. Large crofts not used for crofting should be used to build small bungalows for young people wishing to stay in Sutherland but move from their parents.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is my understanding that in the present local plan there is room to develop public and private housing sites at Sibell Road, Golspie and the former Education Farm on the outskirts of Golspie village at Drummuie. The area above Golspie at Golspie Tower and Backies crofted township in my view have been developed to capacity of the single track roads in the area and the problem of the 2 access bridges and septic tank problems. There were only 31 houses built in 10 years at an average of 3 per year even if there was growing demand for plots the above 2 sites would be adequate for years to come.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golspie - affordable decent sized building plots for locals to build on. Location preferably outskirts of village (i.e. new business park).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The old youth hostel should be rejuvenated and changed to an apartment complex for young families or torn down and rebuilt as a community centre plus youth centre.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The under used industrial site on south end of Golspie for affordable</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of housing available for single people i.e. one bedroomed or studio style, which would be unsuitable for single mothers with a child, therefore allowing a single person to be allocated housing. Perhaps the council owned closed school hostel on Fountain Road, Golspie could be utilised in this manner.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sibell Road Field – Council Housing; Field next to new enterprise park - private/Council; Ferry Road – private; Blaize Pitch – Council; East Shore, Duke Street – private. Backies and Dunrobin Glen has adequate housing for the scarce amount of croft land left.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area around 'Tech' College south of Golspie – mixed housing and Affordable. Don't use croft land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see Sibell Road, Rhives and Drummuie developed (or at least able to be developed.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land can and should be used to meet the demand for housing - a lot of crofting land appears to be under used.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New site desperately needed in Golspie with affordable houses for young couples. Too much consideration been given to teenagers supposedly been made homeless. Housing department should be more favourable to working families and stop pampering young wasters.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Housing – 3/4/5 bedroom in 'rural' locations that will appeal to incomers, particularly professionals with young families. This can act as a driver for the local economy.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many people who have oversized Council houses. Family left home and don't require extra bedrooms. It would make sense to have a juggle around and I'm sure 30% - 35% of re-housing problems be solved.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As far as I am aware there has already been land identified for housing at both Drummuie and Sibell Road. I am perplexed as to why there seems to be no further progress</li> </ul>

<p>on these sites as it has been talked about for probably the past five years. I feel that those of us living locally are very aware of the need for 'affordable housing' particularly for young families already living here and for those who may wish to move to the area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate areas already identified (Rhives, Sibell Road, Drummuie). Crofting land is very limited and diminishing. Once decrofted cannot be reinstated. Should only be used if required for crofter's own use. Keep crofting areas free of suburban sprawl.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take over the Golspie Business Park, where roads and lighting already exist, for single storey terraced housing for the elderly. Also for this purpose put a few single storey terraced housing on the blaize pitch which is unused and a couple more in the garden area adjoining the Seafront Centre from which water, electricity etc. will be easily accessed. These gardens are never used.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Golspie – high ground between Drummuie Terrace and rear of Sutherland Technical School Building. 2/3 bedroom houses affordable for Locals in Golspie itself – no.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a real need for more sheltered housing with warden. The present 'care in the community' is inefficient and wasteful – many houses and clients are not suitable. The modified houses are scattered and many in unsuitable places for further use as residences for other disabled people in the future. Concentration of sheltered houses is necessary – easier to find carers and a warden could cover more clients.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of <u>any</u> sites around Golspie due to monopoly of land ownership – any plots offered are exorbitant for local people on lower incomes. If land was available it would also break log-jam for ex-council house stock which might be more affordable for young and first-time buyers. Yes, crofting land could contribute but no crofts in Golspie hinterland, only would apply to Rogart.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drummuie farmland, this area could be used for all types of housing. Backies Croft land, why is this a no-go area for housing?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land held by Sutherland Estates has in the past always been "raided" by the Local Authority, rightly or wrongly, but at the same time it is the only source available it seems.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No view on any particular sites for development, although any proposal should be sensitive to the environment. New housing should be affordable for the young. Second homes should carry financial penalties. Crofting land is not a viable option.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You lead on every subject with possible development. It depends on the character of the area. The school block of 60's design should be demolished and a 2 storey block of flats built. Golspie is contained by the railway line and coast. No development should take place on the sea side of Golspie.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many 'boxes' going up randomly. A lot of crofts are already untidy messes without further building work.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good housing would help the economy by encouraging people to set up businesses within the community.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Census data and information given in the leaflet show the population in the Golspie &amp; Rogart ward has remained static since 1991, but the underlying reasons are not given. One of the problems in the ward appears to be the higher than average number of holiday homes and empty housing stock. Sites previously used for housing but let fall into disuse and decay are an asset that can be returned to use. Data provided is not consistent – partly provided as a percentage and partly numerical – but on a first pass the number of households on the waiting list (which will cease to exist if the housing stock transfer takes place?) is around 6.4% of the 931 households in the ward. Does this mean if the empty house stock could be brought into use the waiting list would almost be eliminated? Making use of existing resources is in accord with Highland Council sustainable development strategy and would only require infill development to fulfil the housing need. The primary school rolls in Golspie &amp; Rogart are declining faster than the overall statistic for Highland, although this average value is almost certainly skewed by population expansion in the Inverness area. It does suggest the local demand for housing might decline over the next decade and beyond, meaning it is the present need that has to be met.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Helmsdale area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confine expansion to the village.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No – the Bogal Park Simpson Crescent for housing would improve area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many crofts/much crofting land, especially along the 'Marrel' in Helmsdale is lying unused – perhaps that area could be used for affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golf Road, Simpson Crescent – family 3 bedroom homes affordable.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helmsdale and its immediate offshoots, Navidale, Port Gower, Loth are an extraordinary beautiful area and the residents therein reflect this. However there are many derelict cottages on the hillside. These should be restored always ensuring that the external appearance is traditional, red bricks and concrete not in view of business and industrial units to be sited in Brora.</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portgower: To keep young people in the area housing (affordable) and work are needed in the area. Some sort of leisure facilities and yes crofting land could be used to teach self sufficiency if the housing were there.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portgower: Definitely no crofting land to be used for estate housing, otherwise it would diminish the area's character – too many developers taking advantage. Still too many 'holiday' not utilised – empty for years.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would appear that there is a need for small houses for pensioner couples or single people (with reasonable access for the farmer.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Here in Helmsdale there is an urgent need for affordable housing especially for the younger generation. I believe there could be unused grazing land that could be used.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no housing development in Helmsdale. There is plenty land that can be de-crofted in Portgower/Gartymore.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have lived here 3 years, do you know there is an urgent need for housing in the village. The Helmsdale community council should be contacted as they know sites available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Battery Park (between Simpson Crescent and East Shore Street) should be reconfirmed as potential current and short term housing land. Statutory services are available in the immediate vicinity. The May 2000 local plan refers.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Kinlochbervie area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to see a consultation with the community council on a township by township basis to establish new housing zones.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most crofting land is not being used – it should be used to benefit the whole community.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for rented housing for people who cannot afford to buy at present prices. Some years ago the Community Council heard from people in the Oldshore area that houses should be built there instead of everything in Kinlochbervie. No more houses should be built in Inchard Place as the undeveloped part is an excellent playground for local children. This was also expressed at Community Council about 6 years ago.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possible buy out must make land available for identified workers, i.e. teachers/nurses etc and affordable rental properties for incomers and the young.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue of croft land availability is entirely a matter for the estate owners in Kinlochbervie and their tenants.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Muir Trust Land/common grazing has already been proved to be unavailable due to a lottery grant for it's purchase. Rural home ownership grants do not allow enough floor area to allow for wet/drying porches or to allow space to meet new disability regulations. The two school houses in Kinlochbervie need to be brought into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. A register of possible sites for housing building would let incoming workers know what was available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing or the provision of additional housing in <b>Oldshoremore</b> village itself is my main concern. I must state a vested interest as I myself would like to build a house on the previous site of the original croft house of my ancestors which is the small area south of the road opposite the current croft house at 159 which is occupied by my father. I hold the view that the village would be more viable as a community if a measured amount of housing development was allowed for in the new plan. The areas that are currently designated as suitable for housing development seem to be arrived at by simply drawing an undulating line around the existing dwelling. If these areas were to be built on it could have an effect of ribbon or back-land development thus creating a density due to close proximity that would not be in keeping with the character of the village. I have identified 10 sites in the south west corner of the village and have marked them in blue on the village plan. Site 1 is that which I refer to above the road that was the house site of my great-great-grandparents. The other 9 are on either side of what we call the beach road. It seems to me that these sites would be ideal for development of detached houses with reasonable sized plots to be in keeping with the village character. Their construction would not impede the environmental advantages of the existing dwellings. Services are immediately available with perhaps an upgrading of the village mains water supply needed. The land cost to crofting would be minimal and is at any rate very poor agricultural land. On the notion of affordable housing I would say that none of the current dwelling in the village are all that grand as to be considered expensive in current terms. I am not of the view that social housing such as that provided by councils would be appropriate for the village. This is because the village is very much a hamlet with no shops, schools or community facilities of any kind. It is possible that young families, who have the availability of transport, might be able to take the advantage of currently proposed schemes to help finance first-time buyers.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KLBCDP has no mandate covering the demand / supply of housing on the area, nor is it covered in the Community Development Plan. However, when anyone from outwith the area is appointed to a post in the community, identifying accommodation is always an issue e.g. the recent resignation of KLB's two doctors and the current challenge of encouraging replacements to live and work in the area. We also observe a need for affordable starter housing /flats for our young people wishing, as they grow up, to leave</li> </ul>

parental home and set up on their own or marry and remain in the vicinity.

### Lairg area

- I do think that there is a need for more 2 bedroom, council houses in the Lairg area.
- More houses needed for one person and pensioners.
- Houses are needed for our own local young people, houses they could buy at an affordable price during their lifetime. Yes, crofting land should be used – there are hundreds of acres where there used to be sheep and cattle grazed, now it is not being used at all.
- Where the Sutherland Transport Garage used to be i.e. at the bottom of the village. Two bedroomed bungalows for single or married couples. Sheltered housing, crofting land should be used as it was intended for.
- In Lairg area, any review of Council properties, only occupied once or twice a year by tenants living outwith Lairg area and occupying Council Houses which do not bring revenue into Lairg area. Could be offered for sale to first time buyers!
- Achfrish - we believe croft land can contribute to meet the demand for housing.
- I think new housing in Lairg should develop around the main areas of housing and not be randomly scattered around the landscape with an accompanying network of access roads and utilities.
- Site of Sutherland ANMD in Lairg.
- I don't think there is any need for further houses to be built. Some have been standing empty for quite some time.
- No crofting land should be left for crofters to develop not be squeezed. Who will buy the affordable houses? Holiday homes no doubt. Where these absent home owners rent out their places, 6 months of the year do not pay full Council rates out of good earning. Leaving the rest of the community to pick up higher Council rates.
- I spent a year travelling 90 miles a day because I couldn't afford a house nearer my work. Then I rented a house near Ullapool. Why are house sites selling at silly prices? I could afford £15,000-£20,000 but not current prices where peat bogs are selling for prime housing land prices. Why are estate agents governing markets?
- There is definitely a need for housing locally. Especially affordable housing. The only land suitable close to the village of Lairg would be crofting land. We would be agreeable to making plots available at our croft and this could be incorporated into the Local Plan. The croft referred to is No. 23 Lairgmuir.
- Housing should be affordable for local people, especially youngsters, built in traditional style rather than wooden kit-type houses, but using modern energy saving techniques – solar heating etc. Crofting land should be kept for crofting – not lost to housing.
- Achfrish/Blairbuie – refurbish empty homes and make available to keep local facilities going.
- Housing centred round a village is better than sporadic houses dotted round the countryside. Without a bus service it is impossible to live out of the villages unless you have a car therefore young people move away but many other reasons make it unattractive to stay in late teens-30+ age group. The new enhanced Scotrail services should be very helpful for commuting and accessing work from central Sutherland.
- Lairg appears to have sufficient council housing. Private houses in the village not selling quickly. Arable land should not be used for housing, but be kept for growing food. (in case of famine etc)
- Old Sutherland Arms Hotel, Lairg.
- Compulsory purchase of Sutherland Arms Hotel, affordable housing / residential home for the elderly.
- In a careful and managed way crofting land can contribute. Affordable housing of the kind provided by Albyn Housing Society is essential in Lairg. AHS are obvious partners with a sound track record in community consultation and sensitive development of sites, both brown and green.
- Affordable housing is certainly required in Sutherland – new developments should be reasonably priced so that young adults can get on the property ladder. Sensible developments on crofting land would be a positive advantage.
- There does not appear to be used / or additional council housing in Lairg. Large numbers of now local people who do not work are filling vacancies when they occur.

<b>Lochinver area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant number of Inver Park tenants own homes in the town which they rent out to tourists. They should be identified and the housing given to those in need of it.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a desperate need for 3 bedroom houses suitable for young families. Council tenants should not be allowed to buy their homes and local people who have lived and worked in the area for some time should be given priority over people who have little or no connection with the area and no desire to seek employment. This situation must be rectified if the community is to be sustained for future generations. Also land should be available for people to build their own homes. I think the purchase of housing to be used as holiday homes should be strongly discouraged. In Lochinver I know of three young couples who have tried and failed to buy houses which have been bought as holiday homes. One man living in the village for 3 years now owns approximately 10 houses – this is an outrage. Small communities such as Lochinver will die unless young people are able to live, work and prosper. The Council should be addressing this potential disaster now! I would like to offer my thanks for the opportunity to voice my concerns which I know I share with the majority of villagers in Lochinver. I really hope these comments are considered carefully and even acted upon constructively – perhaps the Community Councils could and should be involved in preserving small and fragile communities as I have stated above.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lochinver community buy-out (44,000 acres) must have identifiable potential housing sites. Housing association in appropriate grant attracting arrangements with Scottish Executive/ Europe? Low cost housing for growing families (low cost should not mean poor design – aesthetic consideration is vital to local economic growth.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If according to the ward profile the population of Brora has decreased by 9.4% there should be little need for new housing. Affordable, low-cost housing, or houses built for reasonable rents would be preferable if required. In the 15 years that I have lived in this area there has been quite a lot of in-filling in rural surrounds. This should be carefully controlled to preserve the character of Brora.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites the Council has identified and surveyed in Lochinver. Affordable housing should include decent size gardens if for families with children. Housing should also be of best design with reference to insulation and include more efficient, sustainable heating system. A trial development with latest technologies maybe. Crofting land is providing private sites and will continue to do so. This will satisfy demand for holiday homes (sadly!) and for more expensive detached housing. Too many holiday homes are doing nothing for our economy/society – and should be penalised via Council Tax surcharges, to discourage them.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading the statistics makes it obvious that Council house sales should cease at once. Housing applications should be monitored by the local community Council and co-opted senior community members. All new housing, including private, should be rated according to SAP rating – higher SAP=lower rates. Autonomy measures too should receive appropriate incentives – as these reduce Council costs i.e. reed beds/community composting/individual windmills/ passive solar heating etc. water wheels too.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to see more houses built in Lochinver, people from all over keep moving up putting themselves in a bad housing situation and getting housed before local people who have been on the list for years. I would like to see locals being housed before anyone else, also there is a good spot for housing behind the Doctor's surgery.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brackloch for development. More houses for rent would be ideal. Crofting land could and should be made available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortage of affordable housing in the area. Perhaps on the road to Glencanisp?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low income housing a priority. Crofting land should be used. Clashnessie would be an excellent location. Note – the vernacular is not the only solution to house design in this area. A more creative response is desired.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need both rented and to buy housing . Presumption in favour of houses on Snitabb Common Grazings. Possible sites include Glencanisp Road, Lochinver, Ledmore Forest and Ledbog Farm, Assynt.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable private housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable house sites would be a great help. The Assynt Crofters Trust is making a useful contribution but it's very disappointing to see so much new building and yet a declining resident population.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more new homes at Lochend, Stoer – time for another township to release some land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more holiday homes on crofts. Houses on crofts should only be for the tenant or their immediate family who should live in it. More low cost rental houses needed (on common grazing land.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clashnessie - I would imagine so! As long as its locals first.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What really annoys me is all the incomers come up, get Council houses, buy them then sell them, doesn't let locals have a chance to rent Council accommodation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites on the new Assynt Foundation Estates are the most suitable for development in the Lochinver area. Affordable housing should ideally not be in 'mini-estates', but</li> </ul>

should be on individual sites when outside the main settlements. Crofting land should only contribute to meeting the demand for housing on individual plots.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See attached map – as discussed with Council officials, area of land on both sides of road from Lochinver to Glencanisp Lodge (adopted section) should be zoned for housing to close the 47 site shortfall in Assynt.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nedd/Drumbeg: Individual ‘crofters’ seem to be selling off sites for large sums of money – obviously only to those who can afford the amounts demanded. Can this be changed? However, assign housing association to try to provide housing not based on ability to pay, but need.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New affordable housing should be made available where most people want it (in existing settlements). This will also make it less appealing for holiday homes. We should not be turning crofts into housing land, only as a last resort and not holiday homes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be far more rational in terms of infrastructure and less harmful to the landscape to have affordable housing grouped in mini-settlements on grazings land, as the Assynt Crofters Trust is trying to persuade Assynt townships to do. Crofts should cease to be the location of choice for housing development, which in any case is only a way of enriching certain crofters (or incomer croft-owners) and furthering the decline of crofting - not only because the vendors of land become even less dependent on agricultural activity but because the incomers who buy the housing plots are, by definition, not going to take up crofting, especially if retired or close to retirement, even if the croft were still viable in principle as an agricultural unit once the number of houses on it reaches a certain critical mass.</li> </ul>

<b>Melness/Talmine area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portvasco, Talmine: We are in a small cottage which requires to be extended urgently. Are there any grant systems? I think there should be incentives to people like ourselves who wish to stay in the community and raise a family.</li> </ul>

<b>Melvich/Portskerra area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the demise of traditional crofting, crofters who have land which is suitable for house building should be allowed to sell land for housing sites.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't believe person should not have second homes in this area. I think other people who need a home should have a chance to buy, not stay in rented accommodation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is there such a high percentage of holiday homes? These push up property prices, making property unaffordable for the rest. Get them to pay 100% council tax for holiday homes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As far as I am aware the council has no land requisitioned here for housing. Use of croft land would be advantageous. Development in Portskerra would probably require an upgrade of the sewerage system, whereas Melvich is on septic tanks.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is ample land for houses for rent between Melvich and Pentland and also to the west of Pentland. Only croft houses should be built on croft land.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No shortage of housing, no need to use crofting land.</li> </ul>

<b>Rhiconich area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hopefully more land can be made available if our community can buy. The local estate housing must fit the area and be more environmentally friendly i.e. log, wood.</li> </ul>

<b>Rogart area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of land in Rogart is actually marginal agricultural land and there are vast tracts of land available in Rogart. More council housing is needed as all houses are now out of the reach of people from the community. Much of the land which is crofting land along the main road is perfect for this. The Mart has an asbestos problem so is going to be expensive to make fit so is probably not suitable. Housing – 58 empty and 39 second homes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes – the site of the Rogart Mart land, behind hall and near playing field.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One? In village of Pittentrail – beside village shop and opposite Pittentrail Inn. Site could be suitable for bungalow type houses for the elderly.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marbet Stana, Corry Meadow, between the Garage on Braemar Road end. Housing for young working people, also retired people.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is there a “likely need” for housing. Many incomers get Council houses in Rogart. Any new houses should be affordable to the young if possible and in the village centre. Not too many de-crofted bits of land for straggling housing.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rogart ex-mart site. 3 bedroom semi-bungalows. Cease development housing at north facing areas. Three comments the same.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any agricultural land or croft land can be used for housing development providing its not to the detriment of the agricultural business.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I should like to see the old mart site developed for affordable housing and a day-care centre in Rogart. Strip development should be avoided. Housing could be clumped in a few localities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-Croft land – arable should be avoided. Rough grazing could be negotiated with less impact on croft tenancies.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Rosehall area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inveroykel, Rosehall. 5 properties owned by Muhammed Al Fayed. Only 2 of these are used. The others are empty and locked. A few years ago there was a community here. Good houses are becoming derelict, the other 2 are rarely used. 50% of houses here are holiday homes (Rosehall and Linside).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area around Cassley Drive.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing is needed to encourage families into the area to keep the school population going. Most housing plots go to people retiring into the area. Is there a way of creating a balance?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing urgently needed. Why not ask Al Fayed for land since he owns several properties at Inveroykel, two of which he’s never done anything with and one is occasionally let out. What a waste! Young families cannot compete with the high prices being offered by people from the south, often for properties used as holiday homes. Some housing should be kept for rent only – never to be sold on the open market.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a very good case for directing any demand for social/affordable housing to the Invercassley area, where some facilities already exist. Much private development is taking place in ALTAS, but this has no facilities (except the Primary School) and is not even on a main road (see comments.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing for the young is much needed in Rosehall area. Altass shall not have more houses as road system cannot take it. Croft land should be used for crofting and not as a get-rich-quick fix for the crofters.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing is needed, though the quantity will depend not necessarily on local development, but stem from road and rail improvements.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Scourie area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, affordable housing being built. Croft land cannot contribute much to housing if it is to be maintained in crofting. Not a local demand.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofters can and do de-croft the croft house and build another house for their family member. Non crofters are the ones who have the problem. It has taken two years for a local resident to go through the formalities to get a piece of land on which to build in Scourie. There is plenty of unused land, which is suitable in the vicinity.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scourie More. Some more houses for rent to local people who require housing, i.e. young people.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your general approach of allocating land for small number of houses, and promoting sensitive siting and design could work very well in Scourie if the indicative need for 16 houses over the next 12 years is all that transpires. However, I could see this estimate being out by a factor of 10 or 100 if it became easier to de-croft land or if crofts were bought out by the community. The pressure for sites for holiday and retirement homes is likely to increase in such a beautiful place. At present the arable croft land, used now for grazing, is a joy to behold. The mostly 3 acre fields bounded by dry stone dykes, are clustered between the 19th century village and Scourie Bay. From the point of view of local amenity and tourist attraction it would be good not to allow holiday homes to proliferate over it. One can sense that house sites might one day replace sheep. I hope that somehow the sheep can remain and that space for houses can be found on common grazing ground to the benefit of all in the community.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Skerray area</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should only be used for housing new young crofters and then poorer land where possible. Other new housing should be made available on poorer hill ground. Housing Association projects e.g. Albyn etc, should be encouraged to try and keep young people in the area. People from outwith the area shouldn’t be allowed to own two</li> </ul>

houses in one small community and constantly outbid locals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to remain a 'crofting community', tourists like to visit and learn about crofting NOT housing development. Develop housing round Thurso – it is a growth town offering employment opportunities and educational opportunity.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please see comments later. 243</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Steering group is looking into the feasibility of community land ownership in Skerray. Many of the things mentioned in the local plan have been discussed at public meetings we have held. We also want to identify appropriate housing sites and a possible site for development as Housing trust homes. Could I ask if you would send us a few copies of the maps you refer to in the questionnaire which would help us greatly to feedback ideas to you? Also perhaps in the new year it would be an idea if we host a meeting here, if some of you could attend to hear views?</li> </ul>

<b>Strathcarron area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first priority in Strathcarron is water (re new housing.) 2003 – we were four months without water. 2005 we were two months without water. I have twice been asked if I would accept county water and have said 'yes', signed on the dotted line and nothing happens. Approached Community Council and was politely told incomers should not try to change things. You have an uphill struggle. Incidentally have worked in this area since 1963.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are quite a few empty and near derelict croft houses in the Strathcarron area which could be renovated to provide homes. It would also preserve some traditional buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>Strathnaver area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With a bridge over the Naver, the area just south of Dalharrold would be an excellent site for a new settlement.</li> </ul>

<b>Strathy/Armadale area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I cannot think of any land in Strathy suitable for housing development.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Armadale crofters have already given land to 'Albyn Housing'. Two houses are to be built in the near future.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is there a likely need for more housing in north Caithness and Sutherland? Dounreay, the largest employer, is predicting considerable job reductions in the next 20 years and there are no firm, realistic plans for an alternative. Perhaps if a new nuclear power plant were to be built at Dounreay a need would arise, but failing that I cannot see why.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This community of Armadale does not need extra so called "affordable housing" as the project by Albyn Housing Society for two houses here has caused so much debate and dragged on for so many years. Construction will start soon for these 2 houses. Therefore- no need for further for foreseeable few years ahead in Armadale.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing is definitely required in the area. Productive crofting land should not be used for housing. Non-productive rough grazing could be used as a last resort.</li> </ul>

<b>Tongue area</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is very difficult to balance the need for additional housing whilst struggling to retain the beauty around us. Whatever land is released should be subject to strict control over what is built on it and abuses of privilege discouraged.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to see current restrictions on where you can build lifted. There is very little affordable land available for young people indigenous to the area who are maybe unable to pay top prices for land/building due to a lack of skilled, well paid jobs in the village.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The areas previously assigned by the Council should stand. Deviation from this would cause concern. I can see no need for any future developments. Crofting land should be maintained.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land is here and a lot of sites could be developed – 50% of land sales could be targeted back in to the Community for further developments.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crofting land should be available for house sites where suitable. A few rentable houses should be built. I have been actively unsuccessfully trying to build a house in Tongue</li> </ul>

for 3 years.

- Site below Varrich Place, plus a continuation of Loyal Terrace and above Kirkiboll. Crofting common grazing should be available.

### Trantlemore area, Forsinard

- Can foresee no need for additional housing in this area.

### Central ward

- We are already spoiling the countryside of this ward by building houses all over the place and to make matters worse, they are not in keeping with the other houses nearby. New houses should be built in or around the main settlements of the area. Often these new houses are for holiday lets or for older people. This should be taken into account regarding welfare, doctors etc and few small children will close schools and put teachers out of work. Jobs are a problem in rural areas.
- Tourists come to the Highlands to see the natural beauty and wilderness of Sutherland and they expect to see houses in keeping with the local environment. If you wish to protect these valuable assets it is necessary to mainly build new properties in or on the outskirts of the main settlements of the ward in places like Bonar and not put them piecemeal all over the countryside. In small hamlets all too often existing houses are altered or new ones built in a modern style which are quite out of keeping with the design of properties already there. This can completely spoil the look of these places.
- Underused industrial site need developing – use for affordable housing. Crofting land should be left as such

### Dornoch Firth ward

- The villages around Dornoch Firth have managed to maintain their character and charm for many, many years. The people that live in them have pride in their properties, the community and the countryside around them. Single house building and improvements to existing house stock has enabled these small communities to evolve without changing their character and attractiveness, and has created a very strong sense of belonging. People live in small villages because they love them. Small communities do not benefit from the introduction of so called ‘affordable housing’. This type of development attracts a transient young population who move on as soon as their financial position improves or as families grow. As a consequence they play little or no part in village life.

### NW Sutherland ward

- More Eventide homes in N.W. Sutherland especially aging population and brings work to the area.
- The first item must surely be **housing**. There is a general lack of affordable housing throughout the Highlands, exacerbated by the high level of housing going on the market being bought as second homes at prices well above what locals can afford. This needs a creative solution and this is not impossible, just needs a positive approach by the Council and various agencies. The high prices for housing are caused by two main factors; the high cost of land and the speculative value of a property. If both these are factored out, then the actual cost of building a (say) 3-bedroomed house anywhere in the North-West is not so very high; if one assumes a distance-related on cost of even some 15%-20% above costs within urban areas, this would still enable the actual house to be built for £50-£60,000. So how do you factor out the other two costs? Well, one thing the North West is not short of is land; there is more than enough land but most is under crofting tenure. It should not be beyond the bounds of possibility to get land at a very reasonable cost from either individual crofters or the grazings committee for low cost housing. It might also require a readjustment of the rather narrow thinking of the local planners but both these factors should be surmountable given goodwill on all sides. Perhaps a scheme such as the "GRO Grant" scheme in the cities could be used to buy the land plus subsidise the building of the properties? There is thereafter the need to factor out the speculative profit factor; how do you stop the owner selling the house for a large profit immediately on sale. That can be easily done by the use of a restrictive covenant in the title to the land; that could be anything you wanted; a ban on sale for a number of years, or a fixed maximum percentage of the build cost over a period of years, or sale only to locals, or whatever was seen as the most effective way of retaining the house in the community.