

# Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

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

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Lochardil and Drummond residents value living in an area that has a significant greenspace – and would like to see that protected and enhanced in any new developments affecting the area. We would like to see more emphasis given to planning paths and cycle/walking routes in the developments closeby and further afield. It is important that a Safe to School Walking Routes plan is prepared in advance of any planning developments requiring new school to avoid the parking and car problems in existing schools. The whole south (and central and eastern) Inverness have no allotment provision, and this needs attention.

Allocated to

---

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

Land at IN47, IN62 and IN72 should not be allocated specifically for residential, recreational space or education provision and retail; but allocated (for completion of the district centre including) ie development of retail, a care home, residential, community and other District Centre uses. (1) Delete the land allocations at IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 and replace with a composite policy as follows: "Mixed Use: Uses: retail, care home, residential, community, other IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 (denoted as appropriate); Area: 3.4 ha. Requirements: a revised masterplan comprising a minimum of 1,320m<sup>2</sup> retail floor-space, and 16 houses, a care home and community facilities or other appropriate district centre uses".

#### Representation

Grounds of Objection 1. The allocations IN47 residential, IN62 recreational space and education provision and IN72 retail are awry with the planning approvals (07/00264/OUTIN - 09/00249/FULIN) and with the landowner aspirations for the land, in that they are allocated for no other purpose and deny development of a care home that is also approved. The PLDP provisions at IN47, IN62 and IN72 are too prescriptive and thus too restrictive; and they are tied to planning decisions taken 7 and 5 years ago whereas the Plan ought to be looking forward to the period 2013-2018/2023. 2. The purpose of this objection is to encourage flexibility in the completion of the district centre which is under development such that the full range of approved uses could be accommodated; avoid over provision of retail especially at a prominent frontage position which - if demand does not materialise - could remain vacant and detract from the "centre"; and enable the site to be considered as a whole as part of an updated and revised masterplan. It should also allow for uses above and below one another, which is also denied by the PLDP. 3. The parcels IN47 and IN72 are wholly owned by Tulloch Homes Ltd; part of IN62 is owned by Tulloch Homes Ltd. Tulloch Homes Ltd interests are contiguous with one another and embrace the land given planning approval under (07/00264/OUTIN and 09/00249/FULIN) for development of a "district centre" (ie. a neighbourhood centre as referred at para. 8 below). 4. 07/00264/OUTIN approves a district centre including retail, residential, restaurant/public house, care home, children's nursery, health care, community facilities and a primary school. It does not appear to provide for residential at the location indicated on the PLDP; and it appears that 07/00264/OUTIN is not correctly referred in IN47. 09/00249/FULIN approves a district centre including retail, residential care, housing children's nursery, community facilities and primary school. It provides for education and recreational space outwith the district centre site to which this objection refers (see approved plan attached); and a primary school, access roads, recreational open space and a first suite of 607m<sup>2</sup> of retail floor-space is either built or under construction. 5. The landowner proposes to complete development of the centre with a care home, additional retail floor-space and housing and to make provision for community uses/building. In that regard, the individual allocations IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 should be amalgamated and identified for district centre uses comprising all or any of retail, community, a care home and housing. 6. The PLDP allocates (IN62) for recreational space or education provision. That allocation does not refer to either of the above planning permissions, both of which allow development of a "district centre"; nor a further planning permission granted on appeal in 2011 (subject to Section 75 Agreement, but lapsed) for special needs housing. That approved special need is a residential use; as would a residential care home be. Either would be denied on that part of IN62 which lies within the district centre site. 7. The potential to allow a care home would not prevent or undermine a viable district centre; but rather complement the centre; nor would it deny a reasonable mix of community facilities that could be expected to be enjoyed at a district centre, and indeed - on a tried and trusted model and hierarchy for the provision of community facilities across the urban neighbourhoods of the City - proven to be sustainable at a scale appropriate to the resident population at Milton of Leys. 8. However, to deny the completion of the district centre - including for a care home as approved - commensurate with the residential neighbourhood being built out - could leave a vacant site at its heart, with the effect such underused would have on the vibrancy of a community focal point, its appearance and its enjoyment by residents of the neighbourhood and those of any future care home or housing. Retail 9. Inverness is structured on a principle of sustainable development and in that regard a hierarchial provision of services and facilities is located according to five urban districts, each with 3-4 neighbourhoods. The urban districts support a resident population in the order of 9-15,000; each district supports a district centre, generally located at the intersection of the City's main distributor road network, centrally to the district; and each neighbourhood a resident population of 3-4,000 and a neighbourhood centre. In turn, that structure provides for higher order district facilities (larger shops, more choice and a greater range of services) and lower order, more local facilities (smaller shops, less choice and a lesser range of services). That template is set out in successive development plans: Inverness Culloden and Ardersier Local Plan 1997; and Inverness Local Plan 2006. 10. In that context, Milton of Leys is a neighbourhood; the term district centre having been coined in the description of the

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

proposals (07/00264/OUTIN or 09/00249/FULIN/OUTIN) to develop a centre of services and facilities. That is explained by the (anticipated resident population of Milton of Leys of approximately 3-4,000, and that it is certainly nowhere near 9-15,000); and, in that Milton of Leys is peripheral, not central. 11. Against that background, no other neighbourhood centre within the city (and there are 18 recognised neighbourhoods) offers retail facilities or provisions that are remotely comparable with the allocation for retail development at Milton of Leys. As a comparator - Cradlehall neighbourhood centre (also a modern, suburban neighbourhood of similar scale and character, and in similar proximity to its district centre and nearing its build-out limits) supports one convenience store, one baker, one dentist, one beauty parlour, one day nursery, and one care home; and two units have lain unoccupied (as former offices) for some 10 years or thereabouts. 12. That amounts to some 1,130 m<sup>2</sup> at Cradlehall; whereas approval in (09/00249/FULIN) for retail at Milton of Leys amounts to 2,240m<sup>2</sup>. Milton of Leys, for a peripheral neighbourhood which - because of its elevated position - has limited appeal to a wider catchment, offers 40% more retail floor-space than Cradlehall. Accordingly, whilst this objection (see diag.) seeks to retain a retail frontage ie. equivalent to 1,320m<sup>2</sup> comprising part of the development approved under (09/00249/FULIN), the remaining components of the centre should be given more flexibility than the PLDP allows. Conclusion 13. The Plan should provide for a revised masterplan to be prepared for the whole centre based on five land parcels as identified on the attached diag. This will retain part of the approved retail frontage sufficient to provide approximately 1,320m<sup>2</sup> of floor-space; but will give flexibility for accommodating the remaining district centre uses approved under 07/00264/OUTIN and 09/00249/FULIN on four remaining land parcels. 14. A masterplan as opposed to the development plan would be the appropriate place to consider the configuration of uses and their market viability. That would be a reasonable proposition for completing the centre in a neighbourhood that is approaching the final phases of residential development. (1) Delete the land allocations at IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 and replace with a composite policy as follows: "Mixed Use IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 (denoted as appropriate); Area: 3.4 ha. Requirements: a revised masterplan comprising a minimum of 1,320m<sup>2</sup> retail floor-space, and 16 houses, a care home and community facilities or other appropriate district centre uses".

Allocated to	South Inverness	General	General	
--------------	-----------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

Our client requests that the land at Druid Temple (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H49) is allocated for residential use.

#### Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mr and Mrs Grant, who own the land at Druid Temple (Main Issues Report H49). Our client wishes to strongly object to the exclusion of this site as a residential development allocation in the Proposed Plan. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Our client previously promoted this site for residential use at the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The Council identified this site as a preferred residential development site and we consider that the Council has not provided sufficient justification for the change in position at the Proposed Plan stage. At the Main Issues Report stage the Council identified this as a preferred site and noted that the site has an attractive outlook and was relatively close to the Milton of Leys Neighbourhood Centre. We fully agree with the Council's assessment. This allocation of this site for residential use would reinforce the role of the south eastern part of Inverness City as a residential area which is well served by local amenities and can create a high quality residential amenity. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site H49 the Council states that: "There is no quantitative housing requirement for an additional housing allocation of this scale in any part of the City or Plan area as a whole. It was preferred at MIR stage because it does not suffer from any insurmountable constraints and because the MIR was a site options draft of the Plan. Respondents' concerns about landscape character, heritage, flood risk, microclimate and road capacity are exaggerated. The allocation could have underpinned the commercial viability of the Milton of Leys neighbourhood centre and therefore made more facilities more likely. The landowners' willingness to release the land and increase the allocation's size is noted and the good outlook from the site is acceptable as a positive. However, there are some doubts as to whether suitable, random-free distributor road access can be formed into the area and there is no quantitative deficiency in terms of housing site provision within the City given the capacity of already allocated, permitted and/or serviced sites. The adjoining developer's concerns about phasing should not be retained." The Council has not offered any supporting quantitative evidence on housing land requirements to justify such a change in position from the MIR stage. We consider that the allocation of this site would ensure that The Highland Council has a sufficient housing land supply. This is an effective housing site that can be delivered during the plan period. We fully support the Council's comments that the objections submitted exaggerate the site constraints. We also support the Council's comments that the development will support existing commercial facilities in the area. The site is capable of being physically accessed and development. Any issues associated with ransom a strip is for the developer to negotiate. Our client and the adjoining landowner are in discussions with the owner of the land required for site access. Planning Justification for the Allocation of the Site The site was allocated for residential development at the MIR stage and the Council recognises the positive attributes of the site and the positive contribution the development of this land would have to supporting the existing commercial uses. The Chief Planner issued a letter to all the Heads of Planning on the 29th October 2010 in relation to providing an effective supply of land for housing. This letter details that: "Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuing generous supply of land for housing. Planning authorities should monitor land supply through the annual housing land audit, prepared in conjunction with housing and infrastructure providers. Development plans should identify triggers for the release of future phases of effective sites where a 5 year effective supply is not being maintained." The residential market in Inverness has remained relatively buoyant and demand is likely to increase and the residential market continues to improve. The allocation of this effective housing site will ensure that The Highland Council can maintain an effective housing land supply. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Supply outlines the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a site. Paragraph 55 of this PAN sets out the criteria as follows: "Ownership: the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. Where a site is in the ownership of a local authority or other public body, it should be included only where it is part of a programme of land disposal; Physical: the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development. Where there is a solid commitment to removing the constraints in time to allow development in the period under consideration, or the market is strong enough to fund the remedial work required, the site should be included in the effective land supply; Contamination: previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site or, if it has, commitments have been made which would allow it to be developed to provide marketable housing; Deficit Funding: any public funding required to make residential development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned;

Marketability: the site, or a relevant part of it, can be developed in the period under consideration; Infrastructure: the site is either free of infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and Land use: housing is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms, or if housing is one of a range of possible uses other factors such as ownership and marketability point to housing being a realistic option.” Assessing each of the above criteria in turn, we consider that this site is an effective residential site and should be allocated in the emerging Local Development Plan. Ownership – The site is owned by our client who intends to release the site for residential development. Physical – The site is free from physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed for residential use. This was recognised by the Council at the Main Issues Report stage. Contamination – the site is currently greenfield and free from any known contamination. Deficit Funding – no public funding is required to deliver this site for housing. Marketability – The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. It is our client’s intention to bring this land forward for development in the short to medium term. Infrastructure – the required infrastructure to service this site can be provided to allow this site to be developed. Land Use – residential use is the most appropriate use for this site. This use would complement the surrounding land uses and assist in ensuring the commercial viability of Milton of Leys Neighbourhood Centre. We consider that we have demonstrated above that the site is an effective housing site that will assist The Highland Council in delivering an effective housing land supply.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Like the idea of green corridors by the Burns which are many in the area. Would like to see the Flood relief scheme continued to the A9 before any more large areas allocated for housing

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Site is too dense. Consideration should be given to infrastructure, already unable to cope with the population.

Representation

As a resident of the area, I have objected on various occasions before to this development on various grounds, ie. density, infrastructure, green-belt, public amenities, wildlife. The roads in the area cannot cope with any more traffic nor can the schools cope with any more pupils! Pure greed - integrity should prevail!

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Delighted that Fairways Golf Course is protected as Green Space, also Inshes Park is progressing looking forward to Phase 2 & 3. Would have liked to see allocation of space for Primary School at Slackbuie as feel that the existing Primary Schools across a very busy distributor Rd is dangerous & children can not walk or bike which they should be able & encouraged to do.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

This proposal will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular the loss of valueable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet safe environemnt both for now and future generations.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Our client requests that land at Druid Temple, Inverness (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H36) is allocated for residential development.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Dereck MacKenzie, who owns the land at Druid Temple (Main Issues Report H36). Our client wishes to object to the exclusion of this site as a residential development allocation in the Proposed Plan. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Our client previously promoted this site for residential use at the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. This site was not identified as a preferred site at the MIR stage. The Council recognised that the site has an attractive outlook. However, the Council considered that the site had the following constraints that would prevent allocation: • Technical and economic feasibility of forming suitable road access • Potential loss of woodland and badger habitats • Watercourse runs through site As detailed in our submission at the MIR consultation stage, we consider that these constraints can be addressed and mitigated and should not prevent the allocation of the site. There are two access options for this site. Our client's preferred option is via the Tulloch site on the opposite side of Old Edinburgh Road. There is a retained vehicular access from the Tulloch site. This addresses the Council's access concerns and would link to the residential area to the immediate north/east. As an alternative, vehicular access along Old Edinburgh Road could be controlled to prevent excessive use. An alternative vehicular access option would be through Fairways site in the event that land is allocated on the golf course for residential development. Halliday Fraser Munro had previously made representation on behalf of Fairways seeking the allocation of 4 residential development areas around the gold course (with the existing golf course being reconfigured and retained). The south eastern development option includes a potential link road off Druid Temple Way which would link into this site and curve back into their suggested Development Option on the eastern corner of the golf course. It has been demonstrated that there are two potential access points and that there are no access constraints at this site. In terms of loss of woodland and impact on badger habitat, there are no environmental designations on this site and there is also no protected woodland at the site. This issue could be addressed by the requirement of a badger survey at the detailed design stage. A tree survey could also be undertaken to demonstrate that the proposal will not impact on the existing trees. The Council has also identified that there are two watercourses at this site. It should be noted that the SEPA floodmap does not identify this area as being at risk of flooding. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site H36 the Council states that: "As set out in the representations opposing the site's allocation, it suffers from woodland constraints and confirmed watercourse flood risk. However, its road access constraint can be overcome by a connection from the adjoining Parks Farm development which would allow a relatively short connection onto a higher capacity distributor road and improve active travel connections generally. This would realise a net improvement to traffic levels on the lower section of General Wade's Road. A low density housing development should be possible with improved road access and setbacks from both woodland and watercourses. However, because of the constraints and low capacity within City Boundary, non-safeguarded notation would be more appropriate that a specific, positive allocation for housing development." Our client has commissioned Waterman Group to undertake a desk top environmental report to assess any potential environmental constraints at the site. This report has been submitted in support of this representation. This report demonstrates that there are no environmental 'show stoppers' that would prevent residential development at this location. It has been identified that there are no environmental or landscape designations at the site. The site is also not identified as being of risk of flooding. The Council has confirmed that their initial concern about road access can be overcome. The Council also state that a housing development is possible if set back from the woodland and watercourses. We fully support this assessment of the site. The Council then states that because of constraints the site should not be allocated for housing development. This is contradictory to their previous statement that identifies the constraints can be addressed and that a housing development is possible. It is unclear what constraints the Council is referring to that would prevent this site being allocated. It is unclear what the Council means about a 'non safeguarded notation' as the Proposed Plan shows the site outwith the Inverness settlement boundary with no allocation. Planning Justification for the Allocation of the Site The Council has confirmed that this site is capable of being developed for residential use. The allocation of this site will assist in the maintenance of a sufficient housing land supply for Inverness. The Chief Planner issued a letter to all the Heads of Planning on the 29th October 2010 in relation to providing an effective supply of land for housing. This letter details that: "Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuing generous supply of land for housing. Planning authorities should monitor land supply through the annual housing land audit, prepared in conjunction with

housing and infrastructure providers. Development plans should identify triggers for the release of future phases of effective sites where a 5 year effective supply is not being maintained.” The residential market in Inverness has remained relatively buoyant and demand is likely to increase and the residential market continues to improve. The allocation of this effective housing site will ensure that The Highland Council can maintain an effective housing land supply. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Supply outlines the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a site. Paragraph 55 of this PAN sets out the criteria as follows: “Ownership: the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. Where a site is in the ownership of a local authority or other public body, it should be included only where it is part of a programme of land disposal; Physical: the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development. Where there is a solid commitment to removing the constraints in time to allow development in the period under consideration, or the market is strong enough to fund the remedial work required, the site should be included in the effective land supply; Contamination: previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site or, if it has, commitments have been made which would allow it to be developed to provide marketable housing; Deficit Funding: any public funding required to make residential development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned; Marketability: the site, or a relevant part of it, can be developed in the period under consideration; Infrastructure: the site is either free of infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and Land use: housing is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms, or if housing is one of a range of possible uses other factors such as ownership and marketability point to housing being a realistic option.” Assessing each of the above criteria in turn, we consider that this site is an effective residential site and should be allocated in the emerging Local Development Plan. Ownership – The site is owned by our client who intends to release the site for residential development. Physical – The site is free from physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed for residential use. This is demonstrated in the supporting desk top Environmental Report. This has also been confirmed by the Council in their comments in response to the MIR consultation. Contamination – the site is currently greenfield and free from any known contamination. This is confirmed in the supporting Environmental Report. Deficit Funding – no public funding is required to deliver this site for housing. Marketability – The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. It is our client’s intention to bring this land forward for development in the short to medium term. Infrastructure – the required infrastructure to service this site can be provided to allow this site to be developed. Land Use – residential use is the most appropriate use for this site. This use would complement the surrounding land uses. We consider that we have demonstrated above that the site is an effective housing site that will assist The Highland Council in delivering an effective housing land supply.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

**Comment Changes**

**Representation**

The plan proposes a housing allocation of 934 houses. The Community Council objects to the proposed density, it is far too high considering the woodland and amenity value of the site, and lack of clarity on flood risk. The Community Council would seek a revision of the current density if the Planning Permission 04/00585/OUTIN comes up for renewal.. Further housing capacity is now being provided in the area under IN24 Tornean & Ness-side via Planning permission for the site was approved before the proposals to develop the area around Tesco's (IN24 Tornean & Ness-side) were approved. The CC would like to request the identification of core paths and a safe to School Walking Routes plan. Primary education provision for developments in IN31 and IN24 need to be looked at in an integrated manner and early on – particularly since existing local schools (Lochardil and Holm) have reached full capacity.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

2. I support the councils preferred option (N) at H35a, b and c and I wish the presumption against development of any kind on the fairway golf course to be strengthened to a maximum.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Surrounded by AW linking back to Dunain Wood. Access to development for access must avoid loss of this wood. Designation of IN29 could be continued through to this site.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The site H49 as indicated in the Main Issues Report should be re-instated as a residential development site for the many positive reasons given by the Council when supporting it's allocation in the MIR. In addition site IN49 (formerly B7 in the Main Issues Report) should only be allocated on the basis that it provides for a "ransom free" connection to site H49 for future development.

Representation

On behalf of my client I strongly object to the exclusion of the site referenced in the Main Issues Report as H49. When considered within the context of the City of Inverness this site represents one of the most obvious places for the City to grow. The allocation of this site will, in addition to providing much needed support for local facilities at Milton of Leys, allow proper choice in style and scale of housing available in the new house sector, in a setting with superb views over the city and with excellent links to existing infrastructure. The Council have concluded that the objectors to this site have hugely exaggerated any issues relating to it's development and the positive aspects far outweigh any concerns raised. The issue of ransom strips with regard to roads that would be required to enable any development is a matter for the landowners and developers to sort out and is not justification to exclude any site from allocation. That said, it appears that by the allocation of IN49 (formerly B7 in the MIR) for housing land as opposed to a caravan site, the Council have potentially compounded the situation with regard to access to site H49 by not providing for a ransom free access H49 as part of the zoning of IN49. When considered against Planning Advice Note 2/2010 (Paragraph 55) - site H49 meets every criteria as was largely acknowledged by the Council in their support of the site within the Main Issues Report. The objections do not in my view provide anywhere close to sufficient reason for the sites exclusion and I would again request that the Council confirm their own original opinion by including the site within the adopted local plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the provision of housing at Westercraigs.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

The road to Dores is a key tourist destination and also a well-used recreation route by cyclists, walkers and runners. The Community Council would like to see improved core paths clearly identified in detailed plans for the site so that these became a requirement to any planning permission– in particular an extension of existing core path IN 19.36 along the river (see attachment) and a new built core path along the B862 road to Dores. The CC would also request that a safe to School Walking Routes plan is prepared early on.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Scottish Canals has been involved in the preparation of the Development Brief for the Torvean & Ness-side area and will continue to lobby both Transport Scotland and Highland Council for the need to consider pedestrian / cycling / tourism and canal requirements at the interface of the new west-link road with the canal. SC also intends to look further into the detail of the potential new canal basin at this location which requires a 5 leg roundabout to be delivered in partnership with Transport Scotland and Highland Council. A detailed masterplan is required for this area which ensures high quality landscaping and pedestrian and cycling experiences along the canal and around this gateway / sports hub and which considers the present and future needs of the canal and its users and businesses. Crucially, the road users considerations should be balanced with the importance of the canal / pedestrian / cyclist users in this area, particularly if people are to be encouraged to walk between the sports hub, golf course, new housing areas and the canal. SC would also highlight that this area could be a Scenic Tourist Route location, which is another project SC, Highland Council and Trasport Scotland are working on along the route of the A9 and A82. The Torvean area could be a key gateway location and stopping off point for tourists if the existing landscape setting is enhanced through the road development.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

WCC has opposed this proposed distributor road for many reasons. In light of new information and public concerns, we call for a moratorium until the new alternatives are properly considered.

Representation

West Inverness (Para 4.9; IN24) and South Inverness (Para 4.11; IN24) distributor road We assume that these are the west and south end of the same 'new' distributor road. WCC has opposed this proposed distributor road for many reasons: its damage to Canal Park, the road noise and pollution to Queen's Park and Whin Park, its disputed benefits on traffic relief, the questionable costing of the options offered for public consideration, the ignoring of considerable public objection to The Highland Council's chosen route, and the inappropriate speed and lack of transparency in the decision-making process. The initial stakeholder groups, which considered the project, did not include the public, who since then have gained the impression that the public consultation was a tick-box exercise, only exacerbated by the dismissal of public objections. As this West Link is in two phases, with uncertain linking to a new sports hub with uncostered benefits, there is no guarantee that the second phase will ever be completed in the foreseeable future, which results in only one of the two main reasons for this link being satisfied – providing a road for developers to build houses (Para 4.11; Combined Action Plan 2013) – while the main ostensible reason is left unsolved – “linking the south and west part of Inverness” for traffic relief “resolving one of the existing canal queuing pinchpoints” (Para 4.9), which depends upon the completion of phase two. We are concerned about the conflict of interest between Highland Councillors as Trustees of the Common Good Fund and their role as Councillors in requesting permission for the use of Common Good property. In the light of new information about the costing of a cut and cover tunnel and alternative, very competitive costings of two high-level bridge options (which the public overwhelmingly endorsed as its preferred option), challenges to the costs and funding of the current project (contingent upon unsecured developer funds), and questions being raised with Audit Scotland, we have grave concerns that the decision is not safe and it will be yet another example of short-term vision from quick-fire decision-making. Considering the strategic nature and need for a west link crossing, the Inverness public is asking for the optimum solution, not a short-term fix, which may yet prove to be costly in terms of finance and amenity. In light of new information and public concerns, we call for a moratorium until the new alternatives are properly considered.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Amendments to site requirements.

Representation

5. Requested change: sportscotland notes that allocation IN24 Torvean and Ness-side does not contain any specific site requirements, but instead makes reference only to the provisions of the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief. sportscotland is concerned by this blanket allocation for homes, business, retail, tourism, and community use for this site, particularly given that the Brief does not set out the nature/configuration of the replacement golf facilities and practice area that are to be provided. sportscotland considers that the Proposed Plan should give certainty through its allocations, and considers that in this case it does not. sportscotland suggests that in order for the Plan to provide greater certainty, it should state/be acknowledged in the key site requirements that further work is required to develop a detailed scheme for the site, through a revised Development Brief or Masterplan that will specify the proposals for the golf course in particular, and explain how any housing development will be integrated into the golf course, and which shows on a proposals map the specific land use allocations. It should also be stated in the site requirements that it is acknowledged that existing sports facilities are being impacted, and that these will be replaced as part of the Torvean and Ness-side development. Reason: sportscotland considers that the Proposed Plan should provide adequate detail in order to give certainty with regard to how the site will be developed. It is considered that this is particularly important given that planning applications have already been submitted for the West Link Road elements. The attached document is a cover note and provides information on sportscotland and the context for our representations.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Our client, the Cardrona Charitable Trust, owns approximately 14 hectares of land allocated for Mixed Use as part of IN24. It is noted that the detailed planning policy for this area is embodied within the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief. The provisions of this Supplementary Planning Guidance were supported at the time of the relevant consultation particularly as this allocates the land for a mixture of elderly care provision accommodation, large plot single house developments and footpath and river viewing /picnic areas. In view of this favourable allocation we will shortly continue with the formal pre-application procedures commenced in November 2010 and bring forward more detailed proposals for the land. This includes undertaking the necessary environmental assessments in support. We trust that in doing so any planning application lodged will not be delayed by the finalisation of the West Link Road proposal, which our client supports in its current form.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Marked for 535 homes. The woodland between General Wade’s Military Road and Ness-side House along the Northern side of Holm Burn at NH647422 is ancient woodland with the continuation of this woodland closer to Ness House itself marked on OS Six Inch 1832-1882 map. Housing proposed for either side of the woodland. On the South edge of the road to Ness-side are two veteran trees Tree 29625 and 29626. This road set to become the major transport link for the development, either side of the road to become open space. Trees must be protected. The Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief states that “as much woodland as possible” is to be retained with compensatory planting to be required. The “indicative masterplan” for Ness-side at p22 shows housing to the south of this road without consideration for the existing veteran trees.

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

On behalf of our Clients, Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group, and further to our representations at the earlier stages of this LDP (and on the accompanying Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief) we wish to support the inclusion of our Client's existing Holm Mills Retail Centre within the IN24 Site, and the recognition of its existing retail and tourism use. The reference under Site IN24 to the approved Development Brief is similarly welcomed and supported, and we support the reference at paragraph 5.27 of the Development Brief to the opportunities for "an expansion of the business/tourism facilities at Holm Mills Shopping Centre which is an important retail and tourism destination for the City".

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Amendments to Plan and Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief to reduce and minimise developable land take from road, drainage and other infrastructure at Ness-side. Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd will withdraw its objections if these amendments are guaranteed. Also additional Plan and Brief requirement for the production of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan prior to the determination of the West Link planning application.

Representation

Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd (BBH) wishes to maximise the developable portion and value of its landownership at Ness-side. It has also lodged parallel objections to the associated West Link Road Scheme planning application and its compulsory purchase orders. BBH is concerned about the construction stage effects that the West Link road scheme will have on their land (and occupiers of buildings on that land) and the consequential effect on the scope and form of development on the remainder of their land. Also concerns over economic viability given the proposed level and unjustified nature of planning gain contributions. BBH believes the earlier Charrette indicative masterplan that showed very little open space and more housing development on its land should have been followed through into statutory planning policy. BBH believes the subsequent Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief shows an excessive and unnecessary land take for road and drainage infrastructure. In particular, BBH believes the Mill Lade roundabout is too large and doesn't need 2 legs into the BBH owned land, that there is no need for a distributor road through its landownership (the route may also become a rat-run causing amenity issues), that any pedestrian/cyclist connection should be minimised, and that the surface water and waste water infrastructure areas shown on the Brief masterplan are excessive and have not been justified by any engineering study. It believes its landholding would better be developed via separate accesses from Dores Road (using the BBH existing access road) and a single West Link roundabout leg. It feels the Brief masterplan also creates ransom problems. BBH believes that its landholding does not need a distributor road connection through it because bus routes are available along Dores Road and if necessary along West Link. The Council's approval of its own Brief didn't allow any independent hearing of objections to it. BBH believes it is taking an excessive not equitable share of the funding and delivery of communal infrastructure items. BBH disputes that varying densities is an effective mechanism for equalisation of development costs and values across Ness-side because higher densities don't equal higher value. BBH believes the Council should take a stronger lead in deciding who develops and when. It also believes that the Council should produce a financial viability appraisal to prove that sites can be developed economically given the balance of development costs to development value – the Council has chosen to allocate the land so should prove that it is effective. BBH also believes that operational access should be maintained to its land north of West Link. It also believes that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan is required to mitigate for operational impacts on existing tenants during the construction phase of West Link.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04035 Name DOUGAL MACDOUGALL Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

WOULD PREFER THE ROAD CONNECTING DORES ROAD TO A82 TO BE MORE DIRECT. HOW IS THE INCREASE IN WASTE WATER TO BE DEALT WITH?

Representation

OP 4 DISTRIBUTOR ROAD WOULD SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT WELL BUT WOULD NOT DIVERT TRAFFIC FROM THE CITY. KINMYLIES ROAD MAY TAKE SOME TIME. SERIOUSLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE MASSIVE INCREASE IN WASTE WATER GOING TO THE ALREADY OVER CAPACITY OF THE ALLAN FEARN TREATMENT PLANT. A MAJOR SYSTEM TO PUMP SEWAGE TO THE NEW ARDERSIER TREATMENT PLANT AND DISCHARGED TO THE OPEN SEA COULD BE THE ANSWER.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number 02209 Name Derek Clunas Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan R Farningham Farningham Planning Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 - Torvean and Ness Side Southern Part Type Support Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Representation

Support Plan as written.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number 04132 Name Ian Anderson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Nessside Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Currently the land at Holm between Dores Rd and the river Ness is farmland or wild land. This land has been used by the residents of Holm and the surrounding suburbs for recreation including cycling walking, dog exercise, and wild life exploration (Badgers, deer, foxes etc) for the past (at least) forty years. The plan as envisaged anticipates urbanising this whole area, with the necessary loss of this wild amenity close to urban settlements. It is entirely unacceptable to envision this as there is an obvious planned loss of wild green space and amenity. This would be correctly challenged and defeated at Planning on these grounds. The Park land to the west of the river is no substitute as it requires a drive to get there. An acceptable solution would be to incorporate several hectares of wild land into the Ness-side plan now in a band from Dores Rd to the river possibly to coincide with the power lines. This band should be at least 200m wide in order to retain its wild character.

Representation

Justification for the change is to avoid angst and costly Planning delays when the plan as presented goes to formal planning and is defeated ultimately on ground of loss of green space and loss of amenity.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number 00428 Name Hazel Sears Organisation Halliday Fraser Munro

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Mixed use

Reference IN24 Torvean and Ness-side (Southern part) Type Support Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Representation

Torvean and Ness-side (Southern part) forms a critical part of the city's housing land supply and was allocated for residential use in the extant Inverness Local Plan 2006. The site is also allocated for development purposes in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, Policy 8. The site is located in a thoroughly sustainable location and if developed in accordance with the approved Torvean and Ness-side Development Broef will facilitate the delivery of the Western Link Road, a crucial road link to enable cross river/ canal crossing in the western side of the city.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Full support is given to the housing site allocation reference IN31 - Ness Castle on Page 42 of the Plan. However, the reference to a requirement for a minimum of 2.5ha of playfield area adjacent to the primary school is incorrect.

Representation

The figure for the playfield should be 1.5ha to be consistent with the figure contained on Page 5 of the signed Section 75 Agreement which accompanied the planning permission reference no. 04/00585/OUTIN.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Development area surrounded by AW which is still standing with the exception of a strip around the West and to the SW of the small loch. While some of this area is thinly wooded now, it has long been part of the larger woodland. We hope the management plan recognises this and development of this area is avoided.

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

1. Change the allocation of IN57 from Community to Housing with a capacity for 5 to 8 houses and include the adjacent wooded margins of the Holm Burn and Drumdevan House within the Inverness City Settlement Development Area. 2. Consider deferring the timescale for IN32 to the longer term or delete it from the Proposed Plan altogether and maintain as countryside.

Representation

Our client, Freda Newton, owns a significant area of land surrounding Drumdevan House, south of Torbreck Road. We made previous submissions at the Call for Sites (CfS) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages seeking low density housing on open land in a woodland setting within the Settlement Development Area (SDA). These submissions seem to have been given little weight and appear to have been treated inconsistently compared with those from the owners of open land at nearby Knocknagael. In the course of addressing objections to the Highland wide Local Development Plan, the Council stated that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". However, identification of the completely new and "preferred" MIR Housing Site Options H15 and H49 after the HwLDP Examination took place was completely at odds with this view. In one part of the response to our previous MIR submission on this land and the nearby land at Knocknagael (H15 in MIR), the Council continues to express the view that the need to allocate more land is not merited. In this regard it is stated that "there is no quantitative need to allocate additional housing land within or close to the City". Yet the Proposed Plan allocation of the Knocknagael land under IN32 is also clearly at odds with this view. In light of this we remain concerned about why this allocation is supported and not our client's land at Drumdevan. Reference was made as part of the consideration of previous submissions to "countryside character" and "outwith urban edge" for our client's land. The same should have been said for IN32 particularly as it is of more obvious countryside character and is currently identified as a green wedge in the adopted Inverness Local Plan. Indeed, many residents at nearby Mains of Culduthel purchased their houses on the basis that they would be overlooking a green wedge that they thought would be safeguarded through successive development plans. This was evident from many of the objections to the planning application lodged and subsequently withdrawn by the Knocknagael Farm owners. The area is also part of an active working farm outwith the urban edge. Whereas the land at Drumdevan is relatively well contained in the landscape by its wooded margins, does not intrude into open land and is not part of a working farm. There is also a precedent of allowing some development within this landscape on adjoining land without detriment to the setting of the urban edge. At the Inshes Church LDP workshop for the MIR on 29 May 2012 it was explained by Planning officials that consideration was given to the future potential of the part of Knocknagael Farm which has effectively been severed from the main part of that farm by the Flood Relief Channel. This resulted in a very large area of open prominent land north of the Flood Relief Channel appearing as a "preferred" housing site in the MIR and now in the Proposed Plan, with the remainder of the severed land shown for community allotments under IN56. The green wedge of open farm land at Knocknagael clearly separates the existing Holm Dell and Mains of Culduthel housing areas. Housing development in this area would be large in scale and potentially very obtrusive, whereas our client's land at Drumdevan is very secluded and unobtrusive. We also act for other owners of significant development allocations at Ness Castle (IN31) and Milton of Ness-side (IN24), which have been identified in successive development plans for the last 30 years. Now that the development of these areas is close to coming to fruition we would be concerned that the significant allocation of land at Knocknagael would prejudice their logical development in line with the phasing of successive housing strategies for the City. The early phases of the Ness Castle development will also see the expansion of capacity in Holm Primary School for that development and the limited capacity at Lochardil Primary is under pressure from the remaining undeveloped land at Mains of Culduthel and Slackbuie. In terms of the openness of the Knocknagael land we can understand the prospect of a future allocation for allotments or possibly open space but not for housing. It is also has a "countryside character" location and is "outwith urban edge". However, in the context of IN32 being allocated in the Proposed Plan there is no consistency in the consideration of the significantly smaller and unobtrusive "small scale low impact" Drumdevan land. In doing so we also feel that the Council has bowed to pressure from a government agency. Just because it is severed by the Flood Relief Channel does not mean that it cannot continue in agricultural use. This is also not a reason for claiming that its inclusion for a suburban extension to the City does not "represent a sensible opportunity to infill up to a new, defensible City boundary." The Crofting Commission could take a more responsible approach to safeguarding the agricultural use of the land through leasing it out to others for grazing or sub-dividing it into new croft units. In light of the above factors we feel the Council is not consistent in its assessment of our client's land compared to its continued support for IN32 through the stages of the LDP. In terms of the small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, identification of the land at Drumdevan for housing stands its

own merits.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 32 Knocknagael Bull Farm Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area, it should be protected for farmland or amenity use such as community allotments.

Representation

The plan proposes the allocation of part of the farm to housing development use. Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area. This is valuable agricultural land that should be protected for farmland or amenity use. There was a planning application last year subsequently withdrawn that caused strong opposition from the local community. The IMFLDP should protect this land -it could be rented as farmland or would provide an ideal site for allotments. As an alternative to farmland the preference for use would be allotments, community facilities with some left as rural land. The site is actually below the flood channel, which could put at risk of flooding any houses that are built beside the channel. In addition as the land currently acts as a flood reservoir, a housing development could increase flood risk down hill

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 32 Knocknagael Bull Farm Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area. This is valuable agricultural land that should be protected for farmland or amenity use such as community allotments.

Representation

The plan proposes the allocation of part of the farm to housing development use. Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area. This is valuable agricultural land that should be protected for farmland or amenity use. There was a planning application last year subsequently withdrawn that caused strong opposition from the local community. The IMFLDP should protect this land -it could be rented as farmland or would provide an ideal site for allotments. As an alternative to farmland the preference for use would be allotments, community facilities with some left as rural land. The site is actually below the flood channel, which could put at risk of flooding any houses that are built beside the channel. In addition as the land currently acts as a flood reservoir, a housing development could increase flood risk down hill.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04296 Name Marc Macdonald Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

No building in this proposed plan.

Representation

I feel very let down if this proposed development should go ahead, as the main selling point from Tulloch when buying my property was that the field beyond my garden would stay free and green from further housing development.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 03931 Name margaret fraser Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IV32 -87 homes

Reference IV32 Knocknagael Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

totally disagree to plan, Where do our Green boundries start and finish? This piece of land appears to be very productive to Knocknagael Bull farm.

Representation

Again i must comment to where our green boundries start and finish and this productive land. This area is surrounded by beautifully kept countryside, wild life, quiet, sleepy, location with little traffic. My concerns are, Over development, more traffic on road, especially where joining the Southern Distributor Road, where children are walking to both primary and secondary school.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to



Customer Number 04039 Name Mr G J and Mrs C H Innes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN32 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

We ask that before official developers plans are agreed this is taken into consideration and adequate measures are made to avoid any excess water problems affecting existing houses and land and ask also that assurances are given to that effect.

Representation

At the moment the field is acting as a soak away for any water running off the rise on the far side. As the field has a natural decline towards Holm Dell Drive we have concerns that a development of this nature would increase natural water flow towards the houses.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04459 Name Elizabeth Rae Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN32 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Housing to be well away from No. 8 Essich Gardens fence. No high buildings permitted.

Representation

Regarding your proposal to erect 87 houses on the above land (directly beside Essich Gardens) I am very alarmed and annoyed at this plan. I live at No 8 Essich Gardens. My bungalow looks out over this land and any housing of more than 2 storeys would overlook my house, depriving me of privacy AND more seriously, block out any sunlight from my property. If you must build in that field take note that the ground in the field is ALREADY HIGHER than the level of my property. I would wish any housing be well away from my boundary fence and CERTAINLY NOT high buildings!!!! I hope you will put my mind at rest and change your plans accordingly! I am an OAP and live on my own.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04504 Name John Watt Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Remove IN32 from IMFLDP (assumed)

Representation

I wish to object to the field being used for housing for the following reasons: 1. The field is currently used for training prospective young farmers. The field is near the farm and is an asset to the college. It would mean yet another loss to the fast depleting farm lands. 2. Wildlife from nearby woods would be deprived of their feeding grounds. 3. The Essich Road is unsuitable for extra traffic, particularly near the Essich Roundabout, it could cause considerable hold-ups for residents in the area getting in and out of their housing estates on Essich Road. 4. School children will be put at higher risk getting to and from school. There are insufficient crossings and there will be considerably more traffic.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04288 Name Allan MacDonald Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Site IN 32

Reference Site IN 32 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

An updated existing plan showing the actual housing layout would be more appropriate to allow a proper assessment to be made. These fields should remain for agricultural use. It may be more amenable if there was a proper green belt formed similar to the one created at Parks Farm or is this the only green belt proposed for the City. Is there any no build zone stipulated for the SWIFRC.

Representation

Another Green Belt amenity area would enhance the City there are little enough areas like this in the Capital of the Highlands. The green belt could remain in agricultural use, in some form, allotments have been highlighted in previous plans. Alternatively it may be left to grow wild with some strategic planting and structured footpath.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Leaving IN32 Knockangael farm as argricultural land Leaving IN31 Ness Castle as it is

Representation

Knocknagael farm provides an important green corridor from Lochardil woods for many varieties of wildlife, any development work would spoil this regardless if provisions are made to keep a small corridor. Furthermore both Lochardil Primary and Holm Primary are full to bursting. The Lochardil Primary afterschool club had to relocate to Holm due to lack of space and may happen again next term. There is no way there are enough educational spaces for 87 more houses. In addition to this there is no way the proposed update Inverness Royal Academy could support an additional 987 families at Ness Castle IN31

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like to see the 87 houses/homes proposed for the IN32 site to be removed from the plan and for the area to be used as either community use from allotments or some kind of community facility. Alternatively just left as wild land.

Representation

There are already plans to build nearly 1000 houses IN31 area according to the master plan, it is ridiculous to consider building further housing that require yet more infrastructure to be built. To say nothing for the massive strain it will put on schools / roads etc. I note that there has already been planning permission put forward for this land to build housing and it was 'withdrawn' with over 50 objections. This land should be retained in its entirety for community use as allotments and / or other community facility such as an all weather sports facility or something similar as there is a lack of sporting facilities on this side of the river. Alternatively what would be so wrong with leaving it as 'wild' land and creating somewhere that people can enjoy rather than further concrete and urban sprawl of housing? I believe that the Scottish Government own this land and rather than being short sighted and try to make a temporary quick buck why not keep the land for people to enjoy for years to come. My house overlooks the field and the quiet rural surroundings is one of the main reasons that I chose to live in this area (otherwise I'd have been as well staying in Glasgow) and that will be ruined as we'll now be 'penned-in' with houses. Nobody I have spoken to in the local area wants this housing development to go ahead.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

RECONSIDERATION OF THE SITE - BUILDING 87 HOUSES HERE WOULD BE TAKING AWAY ONE OF THE LAST REMAINING GREEN SPACES IN THE GENERAL AREA.

Representation

WHILE I SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW HOUSING IN INVERNESS, I FEEL THAT THE IN32 PLANS WILL FURTHER REMOVE THE GREEN SPACE IN MY AREA. OVER THE LAST 10 YEARS THERE HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANT HOUSE-BUILDING IN THIS AREA BUT WITH LIMITED DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES TO GO WITH IT. WHILE I NOTE THAT THERE IS REFERENCE TO DEVELOPING FACILITIES IN THE PLANS, I HAVE SEEN LITTLE EVIDENCE OF THIS IN THE PAST AND ANY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT MUST FULLY INCORPORATE EXTRA COMMUNITY FACILITIES. I FURTHER HOPE THAT THE PLANS INVOLVE DUE CONSIDERATION OF THE ATTRACTIVE TORBRECK WOODS AND EFFORTS TO ENSURE THAT THIS AREA IS NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC.

Allocated to

---

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to raise an objection to the request of the Scottish Government to have Site IN32 at Knocknagael Farm re-zoned for a housing development. A previous application by the owners in February 2013 received opposition from the local community and was subsequently withdrawn. There was no contact with the local community when the previous housing development plan was lodged which showed the Scottish Government's total disregard for the local residents. They obviously tried to submit their plans 'under the radar'. I am well aware of and totally agree with the local community's wishes to see this land remain for agriculture and community use. These wishes must be taken in to account. The Scottish Government are arguing that the land is surplus to their agricultural requirements, but I would like to know what this is based on as the field has never been out of use for growing crops and grazing of sheep & cattle since I moved to the area in 2005. The Scottish Government only seem interested in recouping the £3,000,000 that was spent on the upgrade of the Knocknagael Bull Stud Farm. The south east side of the field is bounded by the South West Flood Alleviation Channel and as the field sits lower than this channel there is a possibility that the channel could flood the field in extreme conditions. The field as it currently is acts as a soak away for rainfall, but if development is allowed this could exacerbate flooding in the local area. To the north east side there is a section of mature trees, that I believe are protected, yet the Scottish Government's original plans would have meant felling these to make way for a community park. This would have been and is currently completely unacceptable. The Scottish Government also state in their own Land Use Strategy that they aim to get 'the best use from our land'. How can this be the best use for 'our' land when Scotland is crying out for prime agricultural land? The Highland Council also stated in their current Inverness Local Area Development Plan that the south side of Inverness should have green wedges kept to allow free access to the countryside and to stop over developing. Yet now it seems that the new theory to keep the countryside open to the general public is to close it off with yet more development. There are enough areas on the southern edges of Inverness already zoned for housing development and as no provision is shown for the addition of extra schools and community areas I strongly object to this request for IN32 to be rezoned.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Land should be retained as agricultural land or natural green belt

Representation

To build more house in the KNocknagael farm land is an absolute crime, this is prime agricultural farmland which we should be using for this purpose, it is also home to badgers, bats, deer, foxes, owls to name but a few of the wildlife that I have see on a regular basis in this area. The burn offers a fantastic environment for the wildlife to live, building more houses in this are will destroy the environment for ever. I appreciate that areas for future housing are required but eleven there are far more suitable areas that can developed long before loosing this area of Inverness. I also believe that the local infrastructure and primary schools do not have capacity for additional children which further development will create. I would propose this area to be retained as community green belt with the creation of nature walks to which could follow the flood Chanel from doers road up holm burn across seasick road and right up to the top of fairways or onto Milton of leys this would be a fantastic nature trail to be enjoyed by everybody. The rest of the lower field could be allocated for allotments with in a natural wilderness. There could also be an area for a community based hans on learning project for the local schools to educate children on farming and how our food is grown with produce being grown and sold in a community cooperative to fund the project

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

No housing for this area.

Representation

\* No mention is made of any further school provision. Both Lochardil and Holm primary have had to build additional units for nursery which have impacted upon recreational space available at the schools. We cannot keep adding extensions to these existing schools whilst we build more and more houses in this area. What primary school will be utilised for this new estate and have they got the capacity ? As far as secondary education how many students will the new IRA be able to accommodate and is it enough for the amount of development in Inverness south. As seen recently with other new build schools in Inverness within several years they have had to consider extensions. \* The natural fields provide an important resource and enhance the beauty of the area for all those in Culduthel mains and Holm Dell. Deer are regularly viewed in this area. Wildlife will be shunted back with more development in the area. \* It would be a real shame to loose agricultural land which appears to be used throughout the year. We should be trying to keep this for its original intended purpose. Why is this considered as "surplus land" ?

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Each of these neighbouring housing developments have a strip of ancient woodland on the South Eastern boundary which is connected to a strip between IN38 and IN39. Sufficient buffering between the houses and the woodland should be put in place

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

I wish to clarify that I am on agreeing to these plans assuming there are no changes to the original plan ref 09/00313/FULIN, and in particular, that the area most north on this site between the new road and Boswell Crescent remains as a green area with bunding, trees and hedging. As your plans don't go into the detail of where the houses are on this development land, we assume there are no changes to the original plans and therefore are supportive. If there are changes, it is unclear from the information provided and in that case we would reject the plans until they have been further consulted.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

concern re comment about possible Rd connecting Parks Farm across Old Edinburgh Rd to possible new site . Rd to remain as now

Representation

Will cut off Farms & houses to the South, ? their access. Well used Road by cyclists & walkers in the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The proposed plan allocates site IN41 Thistle Road as appropriate for a Housing Capacity of 5. There is however a current detailed planning consent (08/00255/FULIN) covering this site which was issued on 28th July 2009 for 13 new houses (including 4 affordable for which a Section 75 is in place). The local plan should reflect this existing planning consent. Demolition of an old steading has already been completed under this consent.

Representation

I am seeking this change because the proposed local plan is inaccurate.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

AW on borders of site at NH692432 and NH693435 to NH693433. Woodland management plan in planning permission for IN42,43. WT recommends appropriate buffering between houses and woodland.

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Too many houses on the area which is 4.6 Ha not 6.7Ha as previously stated. The site would be considerably overdeveloped and in fact for this area and in consideration of the sloping ground the allocation should be a total of 92 houses.

Representation

We have enjoyed a peaceful country setting for many years and to over develop this area, which would encroach in the privacy of both our front and back garden, would be immensely detrimental to our peaceful living and to the value of our property. There has already been extensive development in our area and to try and over develop would be completely detrimental. Because of all the recent developments we are feeling totally and utterly enclosed within new developments which we have never wanted and now the proposal is for us to be "overlooked" and have completely no privacy. The only solution we could possibly see to us not being affected immensely by this awful proposal would be to have a large "tree lined screened green area" separating West Road from a considerable distance to the development.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like to change the proposed plan with reference to Proposed site IN44 as i believe there has been a mistake in plot size.

Representation

The plot was recognised by the previously appointed government reporter to be in the region of 4.6ha, which if you check from subsequent planning applications was accepted by the developing agent as its agreed size. The mistake now makes plot over 6ha in size which is clearly incorrect. If not corrected the developer will use incorrect size to over populate area with a level of housing that far exceeds the guidelines. The plot is also on a slope so housing levels when worked out on original size are more manageable. The suggestion to build affordable housing at bottom of plot will produce when other schemes built nearby are considered, a dense population of affordables, not an integrated one with homes of all types spread through out area.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reduction of allocation

Representation

This representation is made on behalf of myself and my wife. The proposed IMFLDP shows, on pages 43 and 44, the numbers of houses allocated for sites IN42 to IN45. These appear to be formulaically obtained by multiplying an area by a density of 20 per hectare. For site IN44, IMFLDP gives an area of 6.7Ha. However, the notice (8.1.08) refusing an appeal about this area refers to the reporter’s impression of 4.6Ha agreeing reasonably with the area proposed for housing and roads in the appealed application. Therefore, the figure in IMFLDP appears to be too high by 2.1Ha. and the appropriate formulaic allocation ought to be 92 houses. We think that the decision to allocate site IN44 for 134 homes is based on a false premise about the area developable. On the actual developable area, the density would be 29 per hectare, a grossly excessive figure, particularly for such a significantly sloping site. An agent for the owner of this land responded to the council’s call for sites on 29.04.11 with a submission (ref. INV78) which noted the following: • existing low density housing to the north of the site (site analysis) • approximate site fall 1:14 (site analysis) • a developable area of 4.6 Ha (movement framework). The agent noted that a planning application (08/00613) for the same site was under consideration at that time. That was for 131 houses and was subsequently refused on 16.11.12, one of the several grounds being a layout which was considered an overdevelopment of the site. The submission (ref.INV78) was for either 120 or, if the existing house site were to be changed, 125 units. The unit mix was stated as 34 affordable 2 storey “townhouses”, 77 “linked / semi-detached” 2 storey houses” and 9 plots for 1½ storey houses. The layout plan appears to show 107 units, comprising 32 “townhouses”, 66 “linked / semi-detached” and 9 plots, accommodated in what “could be considered as a cul de sac layout”. We appreciate that the layout plan is purely indicative. Nevertheless, even with 107 units, an overall density of 23 per hectare, it conveys an impression of houses so tightly packed as to assume a terraced appearance. This tends to support a lower figure of 92 units as more appropriate. The very concentrated, terraced 2 storey townhouses are placed at the part of the site nearest to existing low density housing, none of which exceeds 1½ storeys and one of which is a listed building. It would seem appropriate that the density be reduced here. The site also bounds to the north-east with a green buffer zone which is rural in character. It appears to us desirable that the density of buildings should be reduced towards this also. Such a sympathetic approach is well exemplified in the Briargrove estate, particularly Briargrove Drive and Gardens which are adjacent to the Inshes Burn and blend well with the ten properties off West Drive and West Park. No good reason is apparent not to locate higher density housing on the south–west of IN44, near to the remaining designated development area (IN 42, IN43 and IN45) at Inshes. This would prevent an undesirable concentration of high density housing all around IN53.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

We feel that an allocation of 134 houses for this site represents overdevelopment of the area. The developable area is quoted as being 6.7 hectares, whereas in fact due to a large very old Beech wood to the East of the site, a line of trees with preservation orders on them to the West, and the need for a drainage system the developable area is considerably smaller. The most recent planning application for 131 houses on this site was turned down at appeal on the grounds of overdevelopment. This area of land adjoins Green belt land to the East, and an old area of low density housing to the North, and we feel that any development should be in keeping with what already exists in the area. Inverness has too much high density housing and too few green spaces.

Representation

wood to the East of the site, a line of trees with preservation We We feel that an allocation of 134 houses for this site represents overdevelopment of the area. The developable area is quoted as being 6.7 hectares, whereas in fact due to a large very old Beech wood to the East of the site, a line of trees with preservation orders on them to the West, and the need for a drainage system the developable area is considerably smaller. The most recent planning application for 131 houses on this site was turned down at appeal on the grounds of overdevelopment. This area of land adjoins Green belt land to the East, and an old area of low density housing to the North, and we feel that any development should be in keeping with what already exists in the area. Inverness has too much high density housing and too few green spaces.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reduced development. Alteration of siting of higher density housing.

Representation

Reduced development due to 1) rural nature of site ,2) grossly excessive overall density of 29 sites per hectare and 3) existing drainage and water pressure problems in this area . The designation of higher density housing to be reconsidered and relocated again due to rural setting at IN53.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04286 Name CAROLINE FRASER Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN44 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Reduction in the number of houses allocated on this site.

Representation

Reduction in the number of houses allocated to this site. Feel the proposed planning is over development of this sit. There is also a large problem with regard to drainage, with water building up at the bottom of field and pouring into the burn this I feel is not acceptable.

Allocated to South Inverness IN44 Inshes Small Holdings (north)

Customer Number 04263 Name Eddie Fraser Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph The proposed area has an area of 4.6 Hectares, and

Reference IN44 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

For reference, item A) in Section 3 is cross-referred with item A) in Section 5. A) Why not leave IN44 as it always has been over many years B) Flooding and drainage issues over recent years C) Possible dumping of 'white goods' D) Possible resultant contamination E) Clarification of the area for the proposed dwellings F) Over concentration of affordable housing

Representation

A) Rather than having a 'blanket' policy of building uphill, section by section, why not leave IN44 as it always has been over many years, providing natural countryside, which would not only reduce the load on adjacent housing for essential services, but provide a leisure amenity. B) As residents since February this year, my wife and I have heard mention of flooding and drainage issues over recent years. As two streams run through IN44, my wife and I are rather concerned that there could be an increase in flooding should any further building take place. C) We have also overhead remarks with regards to a pit(s) being dug and freezer(s) and/or refrigerator(s) being buried. We must stress that we have no actual proof of such behaviour being accurate. D) We dread to think what pollution could have contaminated the land. E) To clarify, the area of IN44 is 4.6 Hectares, and thus the maximum number of dwellings would be 92, based upon the land being level, which is certainly not the case. The gradient can be more accurately observed when standing on the road alongside IN44. With an apparent policy of building affordable housing at the bottom end of each 'parcel' of land, followed by larger private dwellings at the top, as put forward for, e.g. IN44, any subsequent 'parcels would see affordable housing adjacent to the IN44 larger private dwellings. F) Drawings have been seen, showing between 32 and 34 affordable dwellings, close together, giving the indication of 'over population'.

Allocated to South Inverness IN44 Inshes Small Holdings (north)

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Stop development in IN 44 It council decides to proceed with approval please consider applying following preconditions. 1) Develop adequate drainage arrangements for rain water to avoid flooding of the road before starting any construction 2) Density of houses to be reduced and development should be moved 18 meters away from the greenery and the present properties. 3) Plant trees in the southern boundary to preserve the ambience of the region.

Representation

This development is a major threat to environment and present dwellings. The project has potential to affect the greenery in the region We choose to live in this region for the country living ambience inside the city limits. Present development will destroy this unique ambience. Highland water supply has dropped to 20% of what it was in 2010. Recently tap water flow has come down to a trickle. New developments are going to access water from same supply. I doubt if the council or developer has alternate plans. There had been regular flooding of road in front of Willow Banks house during rain due to improper drainage arrangements of water seeping from IN 44. The developer has not kept previous commitment to improve drainage. This has lead to road damage. Several old people living in the region have fallen due to ice formation and uneven road surface. Building 134 houses will increase flooding. This road is the only access to my house. The density of houses being developed though with in the recommended limits can have detrimental effect to the present residents comfort and access to water supply.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Correction to my previous comment. Please read last line as 3) Plant trees in the NORTHERN boundary to preserve ambience of the region

Representation

This post is for the correction to my previous comment as above.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reduction in number of houses A more appropriate location of 2 storeyed dwellings... .distanced from existing low build properties (1 to 1 and half storey More space between Terraced buildings as the indicative plans illustrates as very concentrated terrace

Representation

Over development of site. For site IN44 IMFLDP gives an area of 6.7Ha, however a previous Planning permission appeal was refused on the grounds that the reporter's impression of 4.6Ha which suggests a discreptionary measurement of some 2.1 Ha. Over the past number of years planning permission has been applied for and the most recent for 131 was refused on the grounds it constituted an overdevelopment of the site. Inappropriate location of 2 storeyed buildings in close proximity to existing low density housing. This is a rural location and it would be desirabl if housing development in the area was mindful of the existing environmental credentials

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

No housing on IN45

Representation

We live at, and own Inshes Farm. My husbands uncle currently farms the land and it has been a source of economic support and income generation in the locality for over 40 years. The farm will then be passed on to my husband Neil and his brother Alan. Neil and I also have two sons, one of which is only 11 and can already plough, sew, harvest etc, anything that is required for farming, both our sons intend to farm Inshes when they become of age. We also have a number of important wildlife species as per LBAP and I don't believe the council would be taking full recognition of their national and international responsibilities if they proceeded with the intended house building. I understand that the Crofters commission is keen for small crofts to be maintained which adds weight to our argument. Also, there have been a lot of houses built down the hill from where we stay and I am aware of at least 3 houses that have been flooded, one of which cannot get house insurance as they have been flooded 3 times. Obviously the current drainage system is not adequate. Our children both attend Inshes Primary school and I am aware that it is almost at capacity, There is no parking outside the school so therefore causes congestion at various times throughout the day so adding to this would be total madness not to mention increased air pollution. Im extremely worried for the safety of my children accessing the school because of the traffic problem and the current infrastructure simply does not support the intended increase in population.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN46 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Braes of Balvonie Residents' Association is concerned that the housing in this area will obstruct the views of existing residences in our development and in the neighbouring development to the west.

Representation

Housing proposed on site IN46 should be of a similar density to that of Phase 1 of site IN48. Rooflines should not obstruct the views of current residents. The topography of the area has been recognised as a key feature and should be protected. This should be a consideration for any future development of this site.

Allocated to South Inverness IN46 Balvonie, Milton of Leys

Customer Number 04309 Name Lindsay Macphee Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN46 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

1). No further house building in this zone

Representation

1) no amenities for teenagers at present. Increasing this age group will add to youth aggravation with consequently more trouble for existing residents 2)natural habitat destroyed . Deer badgers and other species documented on the site 3)more traffic , parking, and access diminishing quality of living 4)local school already having problems with numbers

Allocated to South Inverness IN46 Balvonie, Milton of Leys

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

AW on NE border at NH687426. Buffering required. Southern part of development at NH699422 already prepared for development. This has destroyed an AW site. Appropriate compensatory planting- or rehabilitation of other site required.

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

I object strongly to the use of site IN47 for 16 houses as per planning application 07/00264/OUTIN and did so at the time of this application. This application was superseded by other applications and proposals and I was under the impression that the said application was withdrawn. Also this part of the District Centre at Milton of Leys was always set out for use as a site for a care home. The planning application plan which I have in my possession show this, with the said housing on land to the East, part of IN62. An application by the Community Council for a community facility was passed by committee. As well as that the planning application for Houses for Hero's was refused by committee but passed by the Scottish Government which stated if the application was for housing it would have been refused. There is also ongoing discussions with the developer as to the use of this land allocated in the previous development plan as amenity land use as Milton of Leys lacked any facilities. There was no mention of residential element in that development plan, this was slipped in a later date by the developer.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

This is clearly not what is referenced in the before mentioned planning application. The planning history for IN47 reads "07/00264/OUTIN – outline planning permission granted for a district centre incorporating school, equipped play area, care home, commercial and retail facilities, public house/restaurant and community building. 09/00249/FULIN – full planning permission granted for a district centre comprising retail units, residential care home, children’s nursery, and community building. 09/00/FULIN – full planning permission granted for a community primary school which includes day care facilities. There is absolutely no acknowledgement of IN47 being used for housing in any of the before mentioned applications. It is clearly designated for the development of a Care Home (maximum 28 beds). This issue was identified to Tim Stott, Malcolm Macleod and Thomas Prag at the Inverness South Community Council meeting on December 2nd 2013. Please ensure this is amended and identified appropriately as accounted for in the before mentioned planning application.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Error in the plan, this should be Community zoned and not zoned for Housing.

Representation

This zone was originally zoned for community use. Planning permission was granted for a community park, this was overruled by the Scottish Government to allow charitable homes to be built. There is a clause in the Government ruling which states the only reason homes may be built on this community zoned land is because they are charitable. Therefore, as the charitable homes are not going ahead, this land should return to the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Delete housing Capacity of 16

Representation

This area is for Amenity use not residential. Facilities are much needed & there is ample land zoned for housing. Homes for heroes went to the Reporter who stated he only passed this as it was a social need & if it had been for normal housing would have been refused.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04081 Name Catherine Collins Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference I 47 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

reversion to previous use as a community centre

Representation

The needs of an area ( social or leisure facilities) which are non existent for a area with over 900 homes. This area needs to be ring fenced for the community as we have enough houses.

Allocated to South Inverness IN47 North East of Milton of Leys School

Customer Number 04203 Name Kamila Baird Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.14

Reference IN48 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

object due to visual impact and scale of development.To many houses on to small plot. The building should be in keeping with the expo site. The plot is to small to merit an allocation. Due to loss of the only green space on the estate, proximity to woodland and impact of wildlife, including badgers suggestion of using the plot for the community use.

Representation

I would like to object plan as the existing development is still not finished, although it meant to be finished 3 years ago. The large plot on the right as you enter is empty, plot in the middle of the estate is also empty and 3 of the stone houses are not completed. There are ongoing problems within existing buildings. It is a disgrace that new houses are build where existing development is still not finished. Within the estate there is more then 25% of social housing and building another 40 affordable houses would have impact on the Eco housing scheme. Within the estate there are parking issues and creating 40 houses on the tiny plot will add the problems with the parking. Also we have noticed the badgers setts and building the new houses will have impact on the wildlife.

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Proposed housing density/no. of dwellings reduced from 40

Representation

Braes of Balvonie Residents' Association is concerned that the housing density of the proposed development of Phase 2 of the Housing Expo at the northern perimeter of the Expo site is too intensive. The current site "Phase 1" hosts 52 or 53 dwellings, many of which are too close together and parking has become a problem. As affordable units are proposed as 40 % of the site we are concerned that too many dwellings will be "shoe-horned" into the site to maximise the profitability of the site.

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

We would seek to limit the height of the proposed "Phase 2" dwellings on the Expo site.

Representation

The Expo site, and much of Milton of Leys, is unique in the aspect and views it affords. We would be concerned that existing homeowners' views of the area would be compromised by the development proposed as "Phase 2" of the Expo site. We would seek to limit the height of any new dwellings so that the views are not obstructed.

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site



Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Housing type/design

Representation

We are concerned that the houses proposed as Phase 2 of the "Expo" masterplan will not be built in keeping with the current development's aesthetic. We would be concerned that the plethora of poorly designed houses that dominate Milton of Leys may serve as the format for Phase 2. We would be concerned that this would have an adverse effect on our community, including the re-sale value of properties, should the new development deviate from the aesthetic established by the Expo.

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number 03939 Name Kyrstn Calder Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

I would like to see the following changes: The area should be kept as a green space for residents to enjoy. It is an area used by dogwalkers, walkers, runners and cyclists. It enhances the area and improves the quality of life of the residents who have chosen to live in MoL. There is a lot of wildlife and I would like to see the area respect their natural habitat. Deer regularly move around this area as well as other wildlife. I would like to see more paths, proper cycle facilities and more facilities created for young people.

Representation

I would like to highlight the fact that there are no facilities for the residents of MoL at present. We have a school and shops are coming but there are no recreational facilities nearby. The Scottish Government want the nation to become healthier. This green space gives the people of MoL an area to exercise that is beautiful and away from pollution. The area doesn't need more houses but more recreational facilities. It is a pity that the council does not improve the existing area for locals such as cutting back and maintaining the General Wade Military Road that is sadly very overgrown. The area is a quite residential area, we do not want business facilities (rumour of a hotel) that will not really benefit the local residents. Councillors should consider if they would like a big housing development and a hotel near to their homes!

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

This area is used by many local people as an area for recreational activities including walking, running, cross country skiing to name but a few. The local school used this area as a valuable learning resource to teach our children about nature, plants, insects and animals. We need to preserve this ideally placed and easily accessible area of striking beauty for people to enjoy as open space and access to nature. Green space is essential to preserve the area we live in and prevent the urban sprawl that is inevitable with poor planning. The Milton of Leys area is desperately short of local facilities, the school is overflowing and the a shop has opened after many years of campaigning. We need more facilities for the local community before we see yet more houses going up and more people moving into an area already woefully under serviced. To take away an area used, enjoyed and cherished by the community in order for developer to make money is disgraceful. Stop the mindless urbanisation of our green space because once its gone there is no getting it back.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

I strongly object to the change of use on this land. It is well know that it is home to an array of wildlife : red deer, grouse newts, ducks, geese, red squirrels, heron, cuckoos, to name but a few. In fact the grouse appears to use this area as a breeding ground Where would all this wonderful wildlife go if you destroy their habitat? A recent news article in October 2013 told of an orphaned red squirrel being found in this area and it was only 5 weeks old. What would happen to all the trees and shrubbery? I spend a lot of time walking and running and cycling with my family in this part. I think it's very important that my children learn about the creatures on our doorstep and appreciate how they live in this environment. The local school has taken an interest in this too and arranged several nursery walks to help youngsters with Eco issues which go hand in hand with todays education. From spending so much time in Bogbain, I have discovered and enjoyed the many walks that are in place off track where I meet other dog walkers who have ventured on to others tracks. I have a real concern over road safety and believe that the introduction of further housing or even businesses would have a negative effect on the safety of my children. Already we have residents, visitors, delivery vans and heavy goods vehicles who blatantly ignore the 30MPH signs and feel that 40 and above is more appropriate. I have raised these concerns with the local council, the Police and Councillors but no-one is interested until someone dies. The local school cannot cope with the extra housing already being built at Parks Farm and although they are planning an extension, how many can you actually keep adding on. The school is already going downhill quickly which is hugely worrying as a mother with several children hear. People have already commented on the proposed land between the existing school and new Co-op being earmarked for a new school. How can this be at this stage already in proposals? It's as if there are dodgy dealings going on already and agreements made by people who don't even live here or know the needs of this community. Already there is nothing for kids to do and a village hall would be of far greater youth to the area and community. As you walk through Milton of Leys you can already see the start of vandalism and graffiti which is probably as a result of the youths having nothing to do or no where to hang out. I have heard from 2 different sources about the area being protected due to historical findings in relation to Flora McDonald and the Battle of Culloden. In deed there is a sign at the top of the Old Military Road to confirm that this was the route taken. I have attached a photo that my son took last year as part of his study on Bonnie Prince and the Battle of Culloden. How many areas can offer so much educational content for everyone to enjoy. It is hard to believe that in todays age the council and planners want to 'overlook' the history and environment so as to just make money and build another concrete jungle. We're trying to show the youth of today that we have to look after the planet and take more interest in Eco issues but if you go ahead with this development, what does that show. It shows that you have no regards for this planet or the future of our children and that only greed and money motivates the Council. It is time to stand up to the builders and listen to what the community. Stop trying to keep everything under the radar just so there are no objections and we don't know what is happening, our doorstep. The community is upset over how this IMFLDP has happened so quickly with few people actually being notified and why it has happened on the run up to Christmas in the hope that people are too busy to object. It stinks to high heavens and is wonder that people are talking about members of the Council being in the back pocket of developers. Total transparency is required and it needs to be remembered that they work for the public not the builders.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Objection to the proposal to allocate the land at Bogbain Woods for 75 houses.

Representation

1. The loss of valuable open space: The Council aims to protect and enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and woodlands. The proposed site is such an environment. It is a haven for many different species of birds and wildlife. 'General Wade's Military Road' runs along the south west edge of the proposed site. This significant historical route and the surrounding landscape should also be protected for future generations. According to Government Planning Policy PPS1, Paragraphs 17-19: 'The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole.' 2. Detrimental impact on residential amenities. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of this area. The current road network is not suitable for the number of cars that residents in the 75 houses would have. The streets are narrow and steep in places, and designed as quiet safe areas with dead ends, so they are safer for residents and local children walking to school. The local and wider community regularly access this area and enjoy the safe, peaceful, rural environment it provides. It used for walking, cycling (both young and old), jogging and by both primary and secondary schools for outdoor learning (now part of the new curriculum). I feel the proposal contravenes both the Government guidance quoted above (item 1) and the Council's own policies regarding protecting the local environment.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following housing impacts.

Representation

Housing Impacts - there are other areas inside the current city boundaries that should be built in first before expanding Inverness outwards like this. Case in point is how long did the houses in Castleton Village sit before being brought into Milton of Leys and this could be created again. The area directly behind the housing in Redwood Avenue is prone to flooding. What assurances do we have that developing this land will not make the natural drainage & water table worse, subjecting us to ongoing flooding issues and increased insurance costs. Also, with many houses south facing, what impact would a development of this size have on natural light given any housing/buildings would sit higher than those currently there. With additional housing brings additional roads and with that people using existing built up areas as short cuts to their home/business. There are already examples of speeding in the area and this would only become worse with further development. The Milton of Leys Distributor Road is supposed to be a 30mph zone and a recent speed check survey conducted by Highland Council for the Milton of Leys Parent Council highlighted average speeds in excess of 30mph outside the school and surrounding roads, even during school drop off & pick up times. Some speeds were in excess of 50mph which highlights the dangers of this road. Any development here would require crossing of this busy road that is regularly used as a short cut / rat run to the A9 from housing and businesses to the South West of the city.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

1) IN49 - delete "75 homes" and replace with "housing." Business use should be flexible but compatible with housing and should include tourism related uses and leisure. This site has the capability to deliver a quality mixed use development with housing numbers in excess of the 75 suggested. The master planning process will provide clarity on the numbers achievable and a ceiling should not be put in place at this stage. 2) IN67 is shown split up into three areas on the Proposals Map, with all three areas being allocated for Business. To allow flexibility and encourage development to the area the following changes should be made to the Proposed Plan: • The use of the eastern area and the use of part of the north western area should be re-defined as being suitable for business, tourist related development, and commercial leisure. • The remainder of the north western area and the whole of the southern area should be allocated for residential development.

Representation

IN49 Bogbain (west) , IN67 Bogbain (east) We write on behalf of our client Tulloch Homes Ltd (THL) who has landholdings at Milton of Leys, Inverness and has been lead developer in the area to date. THL welcome the inclusion of sites IN49 and IN67 within the proposed plan, these sites already forming part of an allocation for business and commercial uses within The Inverness Local Plan 2006 as continued in force April 2012. Whilst the remainder of the Milton of Leys development has progressed over the last decade the sites under consideration have not moved forward principally due to lack of demand for the allocated uses however these sites now benefit from infrastructure at boundary and can play an important role in completing the overall development of the area and providing additional community benefits. THL support inclusion of 75 homes within site IN49 as part of the mixed use opportunity however a greater scope of housing is possible than 75 on IN49 without compromising its mixed use allocation and indeed increased housing numbers spread over both sites IN49 & IN67 would help to encourage and sustain local services in the area (see paragraph on IN72 below) and make better and more sustainable use of the major roads and service infrastructure which is now in place. Milton of Leys is at the latter stages of development with the majority of housing phases complete or nearing completion but with the neighbourhood centre and commercial uses yet to come forward. Efforts with the commercial centre at Milton of Leys (IN72) have been extensive with difficulties in securing initial operators, however THL are now on course for early delivery of the first phase of the retail element although this is very limited compared to the extent that IN72 allows. In order to encourage further commercial, community and retail use to the area along with business uses and to help sustain the services about to come on stream it is clear from our discussions with operators and agents that further residential use as part of IN49 & IN67 would be a positive driver in facilitating the delivery of what is envisaged for Milton of Leys as a whole. In terms of effectiveness and deliverability, all major elements of servicing and infrastructure including road connectivity are now in place at Milton of Leys and no technical nor landownership constraints exist, thus any further development including residential will be capable of early release being readily effective and deliverable whilst making better and more sustainable use of the newly completed roads and services infrastructure. This puts the area at considerable advantage compared with many other sites that require major infrastructure upgrades to enable delivery. With regards ecological issues on IN49, THL have examined the area with consultants and can confirm that the majority of the site is developable with the incorporation of some standoff areas including the pond on IN49. It is also proposed to incorporate a green corridor between site IN49 and the existing housing to the north whilst allowing for well planned connectivity to and from the area and indeed an important part of the overall design will be to incorporate green networks and paths throughout the site enhancing the overall connectivity and permeability. Finally THL would confirm they are committed to delivering a Masterplan for completion of Milton of Leys with the emphasis on high quality design and taking into consideration all relevant factors.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

---



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Removal of site IN49

Representation

We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposal to allocate land at Bogbain West (IN49) for the construction of 75 houses. As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living and the quality of life of the immediate and wider community. Furthermore, we feel that there has been a lack of opportunity for public participation in the preparation of these plans as this notification letter was the first we heard about it. Our initial objections are as follows: 1. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities We believe that the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. It does not respect local context and would be entirely out of character for the area, to the detriment of the local environment. This proposal would demonstrably harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents, in particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. In addition, the proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community enjoy and use regularly for a range of outdoor activities. 2. The loss of valuable open space One of the council's broad aims is to protect or enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area. Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1, Paragraphs 17 – 19 states that: The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. We believe the proposal contravenes this guidance as it is to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area. It is important that the Council protects and enhances the local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland parks and gardens, urban open space, water resources and the greenbelt. It should also be protected for current and future generations to use and enjoy. This varied and regular use includes walking, cycling, jogging, horse riding, cross country ski-ing as well as school projects. 3. Loss of privacy for the occupants of adjacent residential properties. In line with our right to quiet enjoyment of garden amenities we would urge you to consider the responsibilities under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. The protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. We believe that the proposed development would not result in a benefit to our area. To the contrary it would lead to the loss of valuable green space and the public's enjoyment of that land. We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this proposal for a developer to build 75 homes on an area of green space that we feel should be left as it is for everyone, as well as future generations, to continue to enjoy and appreciate.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

The area is used by walkers, joggers and dog walkers who also come from outwith our area in order to do this. The land is inhabited by numerous species of wildlife, particularly around the pond area. Our property backs directly onto the proposed building area and we have had problems in the past with flooding, due to the boggy nature of the ground. A ditch was dug behind our house to keep the water flowing away from our property which, so far, seems to have made a difference. We are now concerned that any disturbance of the ground will risk more flooding in the future. It is a shame that every bit of green space has to be earmarked for yet more housing, instead of being left for recreational use. We have lived here for ten years and it is only now that we are finally getting a small shop. We do now have a primary school which, I don't imagine, would be able to cope with the extra children that would result from 75 more houses. Of course, we would not appreciate having houses built right behind our back garden fence. My husband is confined to a wheelchair and enjoys having the privacy to sit outside and appreciate the peace and the sound of the wildlife without an audience. I really feel that this would have quite an impact on his quality of life.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The area should not be developed for any purpose other than recreational outdoor use. The land is marshy, flooded and present serious flood risks to nearby residences.

Representation

We do not want the development to go ahead as there are established badger setts within the area. Birds of prey nest in the immediate area and are monitored by locals. An indigenous species of newt inhabits the pond area. There is an established frog breeding pond area, which is well-monitored and supported by various local residents. A group of young adults with social/behavioural difficulties have made dedicated trips to the area in hot weather to ensure the survival of the tadpoles- the first time many of them have taken part in either nature walks or animal protection. It's also a widely used and accessible fitness route-this is positive as the Highlands are third worst for obesity in Scotland. Loss of this area would be a serious step towards failure to provide the natural resources required to deliver the following Government policy: Supporting Young People's Health & Wellbeing - A Summary of Scottish Government Policy The Scottish Government recognises that youth is a unique and critical period for influencing future health outcomes. Supporting young people's health and wellbeing is at the core of both Getting it right for every child (GIRFEC) and Curriculum for Excellence (CfE). Take Life On The 'Take Life On' campaign covers physical activity, healthy eating, wellbeing and alcohol consumption. The campaign's major message is that simple switches in our daily lives can make a real difference to our health and give us a feel-good boost. Further information is available on the Take Life On website at: <http://www.takelifeon.co.uk/> The area is a resource used to deliver the Health and Wellbeing outcomes for young adults who are generally experiencing barriers to learning. Highland Council should be the advocate for ensuring this land continues to provide established, accessible learning opportunities which contribute to the Health and Wellbeing of Scotland's future adults and decision makers. The Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 (as amended) provides the framework for education authorities and other agencies to support all children to overcome barriers to their learning. It provides duties on authorities to identify, plan and provide for the additional support needs of pupils for whose education they are responsible.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I object to the proposed development of Bogbain Wood in the strongest possible way. This is natural woodland and was pivotal in my families decision to settle in this area. It is part of the natural beauty and landscape of this area.

Representation

I refer you to the comments above. My property is adjacent to the proposed site and I will be directly impacted by the proposed building of any of the 75 houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Access routes not through Redwood Avenue As stated in 2.3 this should be a SLA. Infrastructure 2.16 Flooding/drainage Policy 3 other settlements Quality of life

Representation

The access routes to the site should not be via Redwood Avenue as this is a residential area with children. The extra traffic would reduce the quality of life and pose a danger to residents. The area is used by most of Milton of Leys as a dog walking/recreational area and due to the lack of facilities would be a great loss. As stated in 2.3 this should be a SLA as there are deer, pheasants and a multitude of other wildlife which enhance the enjoyment of residents. Also compromises 3.6 The green infrastructure would be destroyed thus going directly against para 2.16 The infrastructure and lack of facilities such as a decent play park plus the fact that Milton of leys school is full need to be addressed before any more houses are built. The area incorporates two burns, a large pond and large areas of boggy land. These house wildlife and should be protected. Also with the increase of hard surfaces runoff will increase due to the removal of topsoil which could cause the burns to overflow (these are regularly at maximum capacity as it stands)flooding Redwood Avenue. Policy 3 would be compromised on bullet points 5&6 Milton of leys has a rural quality of life feel due to the extensive woods, heather areas etc and the fact that we have established boundaries. The expansion due to more housing would destroy this.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wholly object to the possibility of this vital green belt land, countryside and nature sanctuary being offered up to developers for an addition 75 homes.

Representation

This is a beautiful area used by many local residents but also the wider community & tourists. This walk is mentioned Internet wide on many sites & is therefore used by many tourists, these addition houses would ruin both the look, the natural beauty, the peace & quiet and the nature. I recently moved to the area for the same reasons as above & use this area daily for running, cycling and family walks. I would feel cheated if this was to be taken away. As a very local resident to the proposed plan I would feel violated by the mass increase in houses, traffic to what is an already overburdened community. This is the reason I did move here. The mass house building programme already ongoing has seen the school you recently built at Milton of leys been at maximum capacity with some children having to be taught in the library hence the reason why it is being extended already after only a few years in operation. I feel this would be extremely detrimental to the area, community and nature and urge you to shelf this plan before any more time & money is wasted.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Objection to the development of land at Bogbain Wood (IN49) for 75 homes, Business (Tourism). As a direct neighbour to IN49 we believe it will have a serious impact on our standard of living. We also believe the development of this site will have a detrimental impact on the whole of the Milton of Leys community in relation to loss of valuable open space, local wildlife, education and traffic volume.

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the construction of 75 homes and business use on IN49. As a direct neighbour to IN49 we feel this would have a serious impact on our standard of living. The development would sit higher than the current houses which would have a negative impact on the natural sunlight available to these homes. The area behind Redwood Avenue is prone to flooding so developing this land could make this problem worse by subjecting the houses to ongoing flooding issues which then results in increased insurance costs. The proposed development would also harm the amenities enjoyed by local resident in particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential area. One of the council's broad aims is to protect or enhance the local environment including wildlife, trees and woodland. The site at Bogbain Wood (IN49) is a beautiful part of our Scottish Countryside which is used by many not just in the Milton of Leys Community but throughout Inverness. It is also used by the local school as they take the children on walks into Bogbain Woods to teach them on the wildlife and countryside that surrounds us. This area is also home to a lot of different wildlife including pheasants, frogs, rare species of newts, birds of prey, red squirrels and deer - where would they go? There would be a significant impact on the local school if further development was permitted. The school is already at capacity if not more with not enough classrooms for the kids and currently having to use library space to accommodate this. I know this is being sorted by adding on extra classroom space but however this will only sort the immediate numbers and with all the building going on further down the hill the role numbers are just going to continue rising. We can continue to build on to a school but then you have the risk of a primary school being too big and kids not getting the desired level of education they need. With this additional housing brings additional traffic around the school area which then increases a risk to the children. Given the natural beauty of the land at IN49 why are we planning to build on it when there is plenty of land closer to the centre of town that could be built on?

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

I have been advised of your proposed development of the above and being computer illiterate, I have no other means or time other than to write of my objection. I have lived at the above address for about 14 years and have witnessed little but house-building, as was planned in a 1997 mixed development plan, along with the school, distributor road etc. most importantly the plan stated in 1 section 5 :- "bogbain wood was to allow public access and use as an open space (90 h.a.) I am a 68 year old pensioner who regularly walks a circuit via general wade track, daviot wood and bogbain wood, one of the few leisable experiences still available in this area. As do many others, I encounter various forms of wild-life including deer, pine martins and badgers, most of which abide in the bogbain area. A heron flew over my head and landed in the swamped area of bogbain on Tuesday of this week. Do you really want to destroy this natural habitat? Your plan will also detract usage of the public footpath to daviot (via general wade track) and would entail walking adjacent to urban housing. The majority of residents of Milton of leys are unaware of the location of bogbain wood and thus the significance of your proposal. Please reconsider and revert to the 1997 development plans for the area which was a major reason for my relocation.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Objection to development of land at Bogbain Wood for 75 homes & business use. Bogbain Wood already provides a natural boundary for the city and with so many other developments not built out yet, why make the city any bigger by extending the boundary further? I would propose that this area of Bogbain wood be preserved in its current state as the boundary to the south of the city and secured as an amenity area for Milton of Leys and Inverness residence to enjoy on a daily basis.

Representation

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness. I have segmented my concerns into the following - Environmental - this is an area of outstanding natural beauty on the outskirts of our city. Previous developments, including where I now live has pushed wildlife into a smaller space. I see more deer on the roads around Milton of Leys now and on the A9 than ever before so where do they go if this land is developed? I walk in Bogbain Wood daily and there is a multitude of wildlife that would be affected. In the last few months I have viewed pheasants, birds of prey, red squirrels, herons, frogs, newts, I could go on. Have SNH & RSPB been consulted for their views? There is also a lot of young trees planted in this site that would need to be relocated/replaced and where would this go? There are also many paths in this area, not just the main one through the middle but others further up which are well trodden on a daily basis. How are these going to be replaced for the people who use this area daily? Recreational - Milton of Leys lacks any sort of recreational facilities and as such the paths from Bogbain Wood into Daviot Wood are well used by all sorts of people. It is not just the dog walkers (who often travel by car from other parts of Inverness) but the mountain bikers, horse riders and runners who use this space on a daily basis. The footfall in Bogbain Wood is really high and how would this be replaced? We have little space or areas for kids to play/exercise and this is an important part of Milton of Leys that compensates for lack of walks or kids activity areas. Indeed, this area is more important than a play park for kids as it caters for all ages and disabilities. Housing Impacts - there are other areas inside the current city boundaries that should be built in first before expanding Inverness outwards like this. There are many sites in between that should be built out first before creating another building site that will take 10 years to complete! Case in point is how long did the houses in Castleton sit before being brought into Milton of Leys and this could be created again. The area directly behind the housing in Redwood Avenue is prone to flooding. What assurances do we have that developing this land will not make the natural drainage & water table worse, subjecting us to ongoing flooding issues and increased insurance costs. Also, with many houses south facing, what impact would a development of this size have on natural light given any housing/buildings would sit higher than those currently there. With additional housing brings additional roads and with that people using existing built up areas as short cuts to their home/business. There are already examples of speeding in the area and this would only become worse with further development. The Milton of Leys Distributor Road is supposed to be a 30mph zone and a recent speed check survey conducted by Highland Council for the Milton of Leys Parent Council highlighted average speeds in excess of 30mph outside the school and surrounding roads, even during school drop off & pick up times. Some speeds were in excess of 50mph which highlights the dangers of this road. Any development here would require crossing of this busy road that is regularly used as a short cut / rat run to the A9 from housing and businesses to the South West of the city. School/Local Amenities - there would be a significant impact on the school role if further housing was permitted. The ratio is 0.2/0.3 kids per home which is approx 15-20 additional kids which in reality is half to 2/3rds a class. The school cant cope with the existing school roll and with the new developments on the link road also pointing into Milton of Leys Primary instead of Inshes Primary then it will soon not big enough again despite the new classrooms being built this summer. With more housing comes the need for more amenity areas and shops. Whilst Tullochs have been unable to fill the site opposite the school with shops etc this is more by lack of planning support etc rather than lack of demand. This area should be preserved as well for additional shops with and more encouragement or incentives for businesses to consider this area for their business first rather than creating a new area that could become an empty shell like the current Carse Industrial Estate. Residence in Milton of Leys would be encouraged to see more shops in our area but not spread out across two sites but under the one we already have space for. If any land became free then it should be used to provide additional amenity land for Milton of Leys rather than being lost to even more new housing. The school is already the largest Primary in the Highlands and making it bigger is not the answer. We will no doubt see issues like this years P6 class become a regular feature. The size of the school & teacher coverage has been a issue in my eyes over the last 2 years and this would only get worse with a higher school role. When you consider the environmental, wildlife, safety and economic impacts that additional housing in this area would cause then I can only see that any development at Bogbain Wood would have a detrimental impact on Milton of Leys and the city of Inverness as a whole.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04170 Name Avril Geddes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Proposed erection of 75 houses at Bogbain Woods

Reference Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

I am objecting to proposed erection of 75 houses at Bogbain Woods,Milton of Leys.Myself,husband and 2 kids use Bogbain woods,we go for walks with the dog,and as a family we frequently use the woods for cycle runs and also we are keen Cross Country runners and it is a beautiful spot.What impact will this have on the environment? Also when everyone is trying to promote health and fitness and getting kids out walking and doing more exercise.This should not be allowed to go ahead,surely you can't keep putting houses up here and no amenities.Its taken over 10 years to get a shop!!! This is a beautiful woods used daily by dog walkers,cyclists and runners.

Representation

As per comment changes.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04177 Name Jonathan Croall Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Maintain Bogbain Woods as a protected green space and prevent any development on it.

Representation

The area identified as IN49 is a green space of significant importance. It forms a natural city boundary, offering the residents of Inverness and the wider community with a wonderful natural playground, used daily by runners, cyclists and walkers of all ages. It is an area rich with plantation and wildlife, including deer, badgers and of course the many species that call the wetland and pond home. It is for these reasons that the pupils of Milton of Leys Primary School use the site for their 'Forest School'. Where they engage the pupils with nature and their local environment, taking learning outdoors which is a key expectation of the Scottish Governments Curriculum for Excellence. I can think of no other green space in or around the City of Inverness that offers the many things that Bogbain woods does. It will be a travesty for the environment, wildlife and many users of the woods if you are to support the development of IN49. It will of course, also create further issues with the education provision for the area. Milton of Leys Primary School is already not fit for purpose, with the library being turned into 2 classrooms, which is totally inappropriate. The proposed development of IN49, along with the continued development of IN40 (305 homes), IN46 (45 homes), IN48 (40 homes), along with the proposed development of IN42 - IN45 (505 homes) seems absolutely ridiculous. There is nowhere near available education provision between Inshes Primary and Milton of Leys Primary for this level of development. Save Bogbain woods in its entirety and return IN49 to green space and protect it.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like to oppose the proposal for 75 homes to be built in addition to the original allocated use which was Business(tourism).

Representation

I feel the proposed change in allocated use - to include 75 homes - will have a severely detrimental impact upon the immediate community in Milton of Leys in terms of loss of amenity space and upon the wider city community in terms of its impact in the overall growth of the city. The area is widely used by locals and the wider community as amenity space - dog walking, cycling, jogging, school trips, etc. It also represents the southern limit to the urban spread of Inverness and is a genuine wilderness area of great value to this and future generations. It enhances the quality of life for both the local and more widespread community. The protection of such areas is fundamental in Government Planning Policy (Policy Statement PPS1 (paragraphs 17 -19) -'Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside....A high level of protection should be given to the most valued ..landscapes..and natural resources'. There has been virtually no public consultation despite claims to the contrary by the Highland Council. The first thing most residents knew (apart from the dozen or so houses directly backing onto the land, who got letters) - was when the local community itself started talking about it. This represents a major deviation from the previous development plan and should involve a significant degree of local democracy. It seems little coincidence that this proposal comes shortly after Tulloch's bought the land - people might even believe there may be a connection between the two events.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Retain site as woodland

Representation

My wife and I wish to raise an objection to the proposed housing development at Bogain Wood, we do not wish destruction of the woods which are used by the people of Inverness and in particular the people in Milton of Leys and surrounding area. We believe the forest areas should be retained and not become a part of the concrete jungle which appears to be happening in Milton of Leys.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01282 Name Dr And Mrs Pumford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Support Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Representation

The area is enjoyed by locals for wildlife, walks & the pond.. Any development should be sensitive to be above

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04081 Name Catherine Collins Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 49 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Rejection of planning for house/development Re-zoned to parkland

Representation

The following reasons -Provision of suitable access and transportation (including road safety, parking issues, effect on pedestrians and cyclists, and amount of traffic generated). The creation of hard standing areas would adversely effect the Adequacy of infrastructure (e.g. sewerage, drainage and water) into the existing rivers which are at capacity. Also Suitability of the site for the proposed development (e.g. contamination/flooding issues). Environmental Impact – such as pollution and contamination also the Impact on nature conservation as the area has a rich and diverse population of wildlife.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like for the plan to be changed so as not to include any building on this land.

Representation

1. Road Safety - Access to this site via Redwood Crescent and Redwood Avenue will have a detrimental impact to the quiet and safe nature of these roads, which is a key reason why many residents in these areas have chosen to buy houses there. We already feel that there is too much traffic passing our house and with a badly positioned chicane directly opposite our driveway which pushes traffic over to our side of the road without doing anything to actually slow them down, an increase in traffic will make this already dangerous feature more of a hazard. 2. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities - I believe that the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. The proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider local community love, enjoy and use regularly for walking, cycling, jogging etc. Again another key reason why many residents chose to buy houses in this area. I feel it should be protected for current and future generations. 3. The loss of valuable wildlife habitat, trees and woodland - this area is home to many birds and animals which my family enjoy observing when we walk and cycle through this area. It is important the council protects these areas which are an important factor in why people choose to make Inverness their home. I believe the development will be to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I am concerned about your plan for a number of reasons: The area proposed is one of great natural beauty and is used by us and many others for quiet country walks and recreation. We don't want this spoiled. We don't want the wildlife to loose their habitat, we don't want the associated noise and disruption of building works followed by a hotel or similar type of context. The whole nature of the area would be changed. Building 75 more houses in an area which you have failed to provide with facilities and infrastructure over the last 10 years is also irresponsible. Instead you could improve upon this natural area by building some quality footpaths and cycle paths. These could be made to link nicely with the UHI/Culloden areas and money could be spent on a quality cycle path linking the Kessock Bridge to Culloden via the shores of the Moray Firth and then on to link with Ardesier and Moray. Think 'health and quality of life' for existing residents not 'quick profits and more faceless building' for the contractors.

Representation

As per changes representation.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Abandonment of residential development Further protection of existing woodland path network Habitat protection for resident roe deer

Representation

This area is one of the few remaining areas of South Inverness with a genuine wild feel due to the topography and previous developments that have kept the built skyline low. From the perspective of the path network that links with the Wades Road path, this is a significant and well used community amenity in its current form that would be degraded by intermingled housing. As there is a large area of wetland surrounding a lochan to the north of the area I have significant concerns that this development would entail habitat loss. A wildlife survey would have to ensure that the roe deer population was not compromised. I am not a homeowner and will be leaving the area myself in a few years for other reasons, so have no vested interest other than genuine concern for the loss of wilderness. I strongly suggest the planning dept visit the site to appreciate its current amenity value.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

My wife and I would like this proposed development not to proceed.

Representation

IN 49 Bogbain West My wife and I were shocked to discover that such a development is possibly going to take place in such a beautiful and natural area. My wife and I walk our dogs there regularly and we frequently see deer, foxes and badgers as well as many beautiful birds. As well as this many other people enjoy this area for cycling jogging and walking. I do not see the need to develop an area of wild moorland like this which has not changed for hundreds of years and which is of considerable amenity value to the whole community of Milton of Leys. If there is a need for more housing at Milton of Leys, why can a suitable brown field site not be sought out and developed. With over a thousand homes at Milton of Leys already if this development goes ahead is there not a danger of over urbanisation. My wife and I strongly oppose this proposed development.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like planning to reconsider building 75 houses on this site.

Representation

I am concerned about the natural beauty of the area where the proposed houses are to be built. It is a well used area by joggers, cyclists, walkers and the school. To my knowledge it is the only local pond within Milton of Leys. The pond is full of frogs and toads, along with a great number of birds and other wildlife. Without a doubt any building work would endanger this wildlife and there may also be protected species within the pond. I was under the impression that the council was committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural local environment, especially those with most valued wildlife habitats (as per the Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1). I am also concerned about the number of houses being built in Milton of Leys at the moment, as the school is already at full capacity. Another 75 houses would surely add significantly to this problem.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following recreational factors.

Representation

Recreational - Milton of Leys lacks any sort of recreational facilities and as such the paths from Bogbain Wood into Daviot Wood are well used by all sorts of people. It is not just the dog walkers (who often travel by car from other parts of Inverness) but the mountain bikers, horse riders and runners who use this space on a daily basis. The footfall in Bogbain Wood is really high and how would this be replaced? We have little space or areas for kids to play/exercise and this is an important part of Milton of Leys that compensates for lack of walks or kids activity areas. Indeed, this area is more important than a play park for kids as it caters for all ages and disabilities.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

The loch within this site is the only area of standing water within close proximity to the current housing development at Milton of Leys. The loch is a significant breeding site for frogs and toads, species which are in decline both locally and nationally. Any development of housing nearby would inevitably mean the site would be lost as a breeding area for them. Further amphibian interest may also be present in the form of newts. The loch also has a significant growth of reeds during the summer and may therefore be a breeding area for birds. An environmental assessment should be carried out as a matter of urgency to confirm the conservation status of the loch. The proximity of the loch to the local school would make it ideal for environmental education. This has a central role in the new Curriculum for Excellence and the loch should be utilised for this purpose rather than destroying its interest by building yet more houses alongside. In addition, I believe the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of the area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. The land on which the development is proposed is much used by the local community for a range of outdoor activities and should be protected for current and future generations.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation to build 75 houses on Bogbain Wood.

Representation

As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living and the quality of life of the immediate and wider community. Furthermore, we feel that there has been a lack of opportunity for public participation in the preparation of these plans as this notification letter was the first we heard about it. Our initial objections are as follows: 1. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities We believe that the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. It does not respect local context and would be entirely out of character for the area, to the detriment of the local environment. This proposal would harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents, in particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. In addition, the proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community enjoy and use regularly for a range of outdoor activities. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, primary and secondary school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected. 2. The loss of valuable open space One of the council's broad aims is to protect or enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. Furthermore, the Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1, Paragraphs 17 – 19 states that: The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. We believe the proposal contravenes this guidance as it is to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area.

It is important that the Council protects and enhances the local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland parks and gardens, urban open space, water resources and the greenbelt. It should also be protected for current and future generations to use and enjoy. 3. Loss of privacy for the occupants of adjacent residential properties. In line with our right to quiet enjoyment of garden amenities we would urge you to consider the responsibilities under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. The protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. We believe that the proposed development would not result in a benefit to our area. To the contrary it would lead to the loss of valuable green space and the enjoyment of that land by the public. 4. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. This land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary. 5. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies. We would be grateful if the Council would take our objections into consideration when deciding on this proposal for a developer to build 75 homes on Bogbain Wood; an area that we feel should be left as it is for everyone, as well as future generations, to continue to enjoy and appreciate.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

**STOP IT**

Representation

It has taken over 10 years for Milton of Leys to gain a shop. This is still the only facility. Another 75 houses will mean a further 150 children. Where will they be educated as the new school is at capacity. Access north on to the A9 is dangerous, especially at this time of year with the low sun. Adding this extra traffic can only exacerbate the problem. To lose even more green open space can only be detrimental to us the residents.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

We firmly believe that the enjoyment of the local green space (IN49) by all age groups not just living in the immediate area but also those who travel and park at the tourist information centre to enjoy the wildlife and open space should be protected. The spectacular variety of wildlife that is sustained in this area is unique and should be preserved for the benefit of future generations.

Allocated to

---

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

This proposal contravenes the Government Policy PPS1 Paras 17-19 and is detrimental to the quality character and amenity value of the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like the area, currently referred to under Policy IN49, to be safeguarded from any development. In other words I would like Policy IN49 to be deleted and a new Policy written which would safeguard the land for its current natural recreational uses, habitat for flora and fauna and essential corridor of 'green space' which benefits both people and local wildlife .

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:- 1. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. (These Policies and some relevant Statements are copied in full at the end of this letter). 2. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people. 3. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected. 4. We are concerned about the threat any proposed development would have on the local wildlife. During our visits to the area we have spotted deer, hare and badger, and some of these animals are protected species. There is also a wide variety of birds and interesting pond life including newts, frogs and toads. We therefore object to the resultant loss of habitat and adverse disturbance to wildlife which would occur should this land be developed. 5. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. There is no need for artificial bunds, this land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary. 6. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies as outlined below:- Policies and Statements referred to in Objection 1 and final paragraph are herewith copied below as follows:- 'The Council's Vision for the Highlands': Paragraph 5.1: "By 2030... the Highlands will have created sustainable communities, balancing population growth, economic development and the safeguarding of the environment...and have a fairer and healthier Highlands." Paragraph 5.2.2: "We will have

safeguarded our Environment by ensuring the special quality of the natural, built and cultural environment is protected and enhanced.” Paragraph 5.2.4: “We will have achieved a healthier Highlands by providing places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to cohesive and fit for purpose network of greenspaces...” Policy 60: Other Important Habitats: “The Council will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance because of their linear and continuous structure or combination as habitat “stepping stones” for the movement of wild fauna and flora.” Policy 74: Green Networks “Green networks should be protected and enhanced. Development in areas identified for the creation of green networks should seek to avoid the fragmentation of the network and take steps to improve its connectivity where this is appropriate. ....The main principles of the Council’s Future Guidance on Green Networks are to help promote green space linkages and to safeguard and enhance wildlife corridors in and around new and existing developments...and to set out mechanisms for delivery of projects to maintain and enhance the existing green network.” Policy 75: Open Space “The Council’s long term aim for open space provision is for: -the creation of sustainable networks of open space of high quality -areas of local open space that are accessible by foot and linked to the wider network -fit for purpose green spaces and sports facilities that support and enhance biodiversity; and -open spaces that improve the quality of life of residents and visitors Existing areas of high quality, accessible and fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and enhancement will be sought where appropriate.” Public Access: Para 23.7.1: “Access to the outdoors is important to the Highlands for recreation tourism and to help everyone maintain a healthy lifestyle”.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the proposal to allocate land to build 75 houses on the site IN49 (Bogbain West) - i.e. I do not want this land to be disturbed / developed for housing.

Representation

1. The loss of valuable open space. One of the council's broad aims is to protect and enhance local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is full of wildlife and I regularly take my children walks there to enjoy it. I would not this to become more house. 2. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities - I believe it will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by my family and others.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following education / amenity issues.

Representation

School/Local Amenities - there would be a significant impact on the school role if further housing was permitted. The ratio is apparently 0.2/0.3 kids per home (which I think Milton of Leys far supercedes!) but even this is approximately 15-20 additional kids which in reality is half to 2/3rds a class. The school cannot cope with the existing school roll and with the new developments on the link road also pointing into Milton of Leys Primary instead of Inshes Primary then it will soon not big enough again despite the new classrooms being built this summer. With more housing comes the need for more amenity areas and shops. Whilst Tulloch's have been unable to fill the site opposite the school with shops etc this is more by lack of planning support etc rather than lack of demand. This area should be preserved as well for additional shops with and more encouragement or incentives for businesses to consider this area for their business first rather than creating a new area that could become an empty shell like the current Carse Industrial Estate. Residence in Milton of Leys would be encouraged to see more shops in our area but not spread out across two sites but under the one we already have space for. If any land became free then it should be used to provide additional amenity land for Milton of Leys rather than being lost to even more new housing. The school is already the largest Primary in the Highlands and making it bigger is not the answer. We will no doubt see issues like this years P6 class become a regular feature. The size of the school & teacher coverage has been an issue in my eyes over the last 2 years and this would only get worse with a higher school role.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wish to express my deep concern regarding the proposed development of Bogbain Wood.

Representation

This area is a wildlife haven. I have seen deer, pheasants, grouse, herons, swans, foxes, varieties of birds too numerous to mention. Each year a fawn is born very close to our home. Milton of Leys has few enough amenities and my belief is that the government aims to protect wildlife habitats. This a wonderful open area which is enjoyed by residents and visitors alike for outdoor activities such as walking, cycling ,running and even horse riding. Again I believe government policy seeks to protect these sort of amenity areas. (Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1, Pars 17-19) In summation I do not believe this is a suitable area for development.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

I would like the area currently referred to under Policy IN49 to be safeguarded from development. In other words, I would like Policy IN 49 deleted and a new Policy written which would safeguard the land for its current natural recreational uses, habitat for flora and fauna and essential 'green corridor' of open space which benefits both Highland people and local wildlife.

#### Representation

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. (These Policies and some relevant Statements are copied in full at the end of this letter).
2. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people.
3. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected.
4. We are concerned about the threat any proposed development would have on the local wildlife. During our visits to the area we have spotted deer, hare and badger, and some of these animals are protected species. There is also a wide variety of birds and interesting pond life including newts, frogs and toads. We therefore object to the resultant loss of habitat and adverse disturbance to wildlife which would occur should this land be developed.
5. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. There is no need for artificial bunds, this land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary.
6. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies, as outlined below:- Policies and Statements referred to in Objection 1 above and final paragraph are herewith copied below as follows:- 'The Council's Vision for the Highlands': Paragraph 5.1: "By 2030... the Highlands will have created sustainable communities, balancing population growth, economic development and the safeguarding of the environment...and have a fairer and healthier Highlands." Paragraph 5.2.2: "We will have

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments.  
The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

safeguarded our Environment by ensuring the special quality of the natural, built and cultural environment is protected and enhanced.” Paragraph 5.2.4: “We will have achieved a healthier Highlands by providing places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to cohesive and fit for purpose network of greenspaces...” Policy 60: Other Important Habitats: “The Council will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance because of their linear and continuous structure or combination as habitat “stepping stones” for the movement of wild fauna and flora.” Policy 74: Green Networks “Green networks should be protected and enhanced. Development in areas identified for the creation of green networks should seek to avoid the fragmentation of the network and take steps to improve its connectivity where this is appropriate. ....The main principles of the Council’s Future Guidance on Green Networks are to help promote green space linkages and to safeguard and enhance wildlife corridors in and around new and existing developments...and to set out mechanisms for delivery of projects to maintain and enhance the existing green network.” Policy 75: Open Space “The Council’s long term aim for open space provision is for: -the creation of sustainable networks of open space of high quality -areas of local open space that are accessible by foot and linked to the wider network -fit for purpose green spaces and sports facilities that support and enhance biodiversity; and -open spaces that improve the quality of life of residents and visitors Existing areas of high quality, accessible and fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and enhancement will be sought where appropriate.” Public Access: Para 23.7.1: “Access to the outdoors is important to the Highlands for recreation tourism and to help everyone maintain a healthy lifestyle”.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I object to any housing development being brought forward in the area referred to in IN49. This woodland area is a popular area for recreation, walking, cycling and has many species of wildlife resident (e.g. herons, deer, badgers, owls which I have seen there). I propose that development of this area is reconsidered so it can remain as a recreation area for the benefit of the residents of the increasingly high density housing areas in Milton of Leys.

Representation

I object to any housing development being brought forward in the area referred to in IN49. This woodland area is a popular area for recreation, walking, cycling and has many species of wildlife resident (e.g. herons, deer, badgers, owls which I have seen there). I propose that development of this area is reconsidered so it can remain as a recreation area for the benefit of the residents of the increasingly high density housing areas in Milton of Leys.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04302 Name Nicola Macpherson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 17-19

Reference IN49 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

DO NOT BUILD ON THIS LAND.

Representation

Detrimental impact upon residential amenities. We believe that the posed development will harm the character and appearance of our area the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular, the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe environment. The proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community love and enjoy and use regularly ski-ing. Our school utilises this are a as well, The area should be protected for current and future for a range of outdoor activities ranging from walking, cycling, jogging and cross country generations. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04303 Name PETER MACPHERSON Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 17-19

Reference IN49 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

DO NOT BUILD ON THIS AREA OF LAND

Representation

Detrimental impact upon residential amenities. We believe that the posed development will harm the character and appearance of our area the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular, the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe environment. The proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community love and enjoy and use regularly ski-ing. Our school utilises this are a as well, The area should be protected for current and future for a range of outdoor activities ranging from walking, cycling, jogging and cross country generations. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

The use of the area marked IN49 Bogbain Wood for housing would be of significant detriment to the people of the Milton of Leys area. This is a place of much valued green space in an increasingly densely populated area. I along with many others also believe that such an application is in clear contravention to Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1 Para 17-19 in relation to your commitment to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside as a whole. Covering this piece of ground with yet more and more houses fails to meet that objective and deprives the people and children of this area of a site that currently provides much needed recreational use for many. It is used for sporting purposes as well as trips and field work for the local schools. There are plenty houses on the market in Inverness just now, so why do we need even more? I would also point out that this area is currently deprived of many of the amenities required for such a large population anyway. The opening of our new Co-op shop today, some 12 years after I moved here just shows how little the council cares for the people of the community, yet how willing them seem to be to pander to the whims of developers who want to tear up the few remaining green spaces in and around this lovely city. No further development should be considered in this area until such time as the much promised shops and amenities are completed, as we were promised when we moved here back in 2001. The council should not fall for any further deception and hollow promises offered by developers in relation to new builds and should rather compel them to deliver on previous promises as a condition for even considering any further expansion in this place. Thank you.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like the area currently referred to under Policy IN 49 to be safeguarded from development. In other words, I would like Policy IN 49 deleted and a new Policy written which would safeguard the land for its current natural recreational uses, habitat for flora and fauna, and essential 'green corridor' of open space, which benefits both Highland people and local wildlife.

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. (These Policies and some relevant Statements are copied in full at the end of this letter).
2. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people.
3. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected.
4. We are concerned about the threat any proposed development would have on the local wildlife. During our visits to the area we have spotted deer, hare and badger, and some of these animals are protected species. There is also a wide variety of birds and interesting pond life including newts, frogs and toads. We therefore object to the resultant loss of habitat and adverse disturbance to wildlife which would occur should this land be developed.
5. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. There is no need for artificial bunds, this land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary.
6. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies, as outlined below:- Policies and Statements referred to in Objection 1 above and final paragraph are herewith copied below as follows:- 'The Council's Vision for the Highlands':- Paragraph 5.1: "By 2030... the Highlands will have created sustainable communities, balancing population growth, economic development and the safeguarding of the environment...and have a fairer and healthier Highlands." Paragraph 5.2.2: "We will have

safeguarded our Environment by ensuring the special quality of the natural, built and cultural environment is protected and enhanced.” Paragraph 5.2.4: “We will have achieved a healthier Highlands by providing places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to cohesive and fit for purpose network of greenspaces...” Policy 60: Other Important Habitats: “The Council will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance because of their linear and continuous structure or combination as habitat “stepping stones” for the movement of wild fauna and flora.” Policy 74: Green Networks “Green networks should be protected and enhanced. Development in areas identified for the creation of green networks should seek to avoid the fragmentation of the network and take steps to improve its connectivity where this is appropriate. ....The main principles of the Council’s Future Guidance on Green Networks are to help promote green space linkages and to safeguard and enhance wildlife corridors in and around new and existing developments...and to set out mechanisms for delivery of projects to maintain and enhance the existing green network.” Policy 75: Open Space “The Council’s long term aim for open space provision is for: -the creation of sustainable networks of open space of high quality -areas of local open space that are accessible by foot and linked to the wider network -fit for purpose green spaces and sports facilities that support and enhance biodiversity; and -open spaces that improve the quality of life of residents and visitors. Existing areas of high quality, accessible and fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and enhancement will be sought where appropriate.” Public Access: Para 23.7.1: “Access to the outdoors is important to the Highlands for recreation tourism and to help everyone maintain a healthy lifestyle.”

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following environmental factors.

Representation

Environmental - this is an area of outstanding natural beauty on the outskirts of Inverness. Previous developments, including where I now live in Milton of Leys has pushed wildlife into a smaller space. I see more deer on the roads around Milton of Leys now and on the A9 than ever before so where do they go if this land is developed? Umpteen people walk in Bogbain Woods daily and there is a multitude of wildlife that would be affected. In the last few months I have spotted pheasants, birds of prey, red squirrels, herons, frogs, newts, I could go on. Have SNH & RSPB been consulted for their views? There is also a lot of young trees planted in this site that would need to be relocated/replaced and where would this go? There are also many paths in this area, not just the main one through the middle but others further up which are well trodden on a daily basis. How are these going to be replaced for the people who use this area daily? When we moved to the area we were in fact told that the pond behind the houses in Redwood Avenue is a Site of Scientific Interest due to the wildlife if homes in and around it - this should remain completely untouched.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

---

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

To not include IN49-Bogbain Wood as a development area and retain it in its present state

Representation

I wish to object to the proposal of building 75 homes at site IN49-Bogbain Wood for the following reasons. 1. Inverness is one of the fastest growing cities in Western Europe (Martin 2007). This has led to the unabated expansion of the city limits and inevitable erosion of natural habitats surrounding the city. The population in 2001 was 51,000 and by 2007 had risen to 60,000. It is expected to double in the next 30 years (Martin 2007). With this population growth there is a potential for increased environmental pollution and a reduction in the air quality and quality of life of which Inverness prides itself. This situation is compounded by the topography of the surrounding countryside i.e. mountains limit physical expansion so any growth will be in confined space (Lawton et.al. 2010:Para.23). As the city is surrounded by mountains continued expansion of house building limits the tree growing area and the city will be surrounded by moor and heath. Reducing tree growing areas around the city is a short-sighted and dangerous precedent. It risks soil erosion and creating alluvial deposits which increases the danger of flooding and the undermining of the foundations of buildings on perimeters of the city. There will be an inevitable reduction of natural habitats for the fauna and flora. There is recent evidence of an increase in road kills, such as deer, observed only a couple of days ago on the link road through Milton of Leys to Inshes. It is on this stretch of road that two new housing developments are under construction, only a year or so after a neighbouring development was completed. 2. The area is a popular recreational area. On an evening's walk this summer in the area I met 26 people and 18 dogs over the period of one hour. These recreational areas should not be reduced and the building of 75 houses in an unspoilt area only serves to increase pressure on other areas with the constant degradation of the environment. 3. I understand that there is a constant pressure from central government to build houses in their insatiable quest for financial growth. Estates like this may well prosper during a thriving economy but another recession and they risk becoming areas of economic and social deprivation, especially as there is increasing concern about personal debt (Pond et.al 2013) 4. Facilities and amenities in the area are limited. This creates a situation where every family who will live on this estate will need at least one car, leading to the inevitable congestion and attendant environment issues. Driving past Milton of Leys and Inshes primary school at starting and finishing times highlights this. REFERENCES LAWTON, J.E.A., 2010. Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, 29th Study: The Environmental Impacts of Demographic Change in the UK Visit to Inverness and Perth : 26-28 APRIL 2010. 29th. London: Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution. MARTIN, L., 26th March, 2007-last update, Inverness: the new Shangri-La? [Homepage of New Statesman, London, UK], [Online]. Available: <http://www.newstatesman.com/life-and-society/2007/03/city-inverness-poland-local> [10th December 2013]. POND, C. et.al., 2013. Maxed Out:Serious Pesronal Debt in Britain. The Centre for Social Justice [Online] Available: [http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/UserStorage/pdf/Pdf%20reports/CSJ\\_Serious\\_Debt\\_report\\_WEB\\_final.pdf](http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/UserStorage/pdf/Pdf%20reports/CSJ_Serious_Debt_report_WEB_final.pdf) 12th December 2013

Allocated to

Customer Number 03933 Name Robert Robertson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN50 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Please develop at least some of IN50 as a public park and walking area as you have done at Wester Inshes.

Representation

There is a paucity of public recreational areas on the south side of Inverness due to the huge increase in building. There are very large and mature trees on the north aspect of IN50, including oaks, that must be preserved. I have got close to 3 long eared owls there. Inverness lacks public spaces due to the boom in house construction that appears too dense and impersonal to many people. Many local residents currently use IN50 for recreation as there is nothing else close by. Surely a modern and civilised city deserves more than just dense housing, unrelieved by open and pleasant spaces for children and adults to play and relax?

Allocated to South Inverness IN50 Land south of Asda

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site IN50 Land south of Asda Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

F&C supports the proposal to restrict the floorspace at this location to neighbourhood catchment scale only. However we would suggest including the words 'and type' after 'scale' so that the requirements of the site reads: 'Requirements: Any retail component limited to neighbourhood catchment scale and type' This change is to protect the City Centre from potential out of town expansion for floorspace that should be directed towards the city centre in the first instance.

Representation

F&C supports the proposal to restrict the floorspace at this location to neighbourhood catchment scale only. However we would suggest including the words 'and type' after 'scale' so that the requirements of the site reads: 'Requirements: Any retail component limited to neighbourhood catchment scale and type' This change is to protect the City Centre from potential out of town expansion for floorspace that should be directed towards the city centre in the first instance.

Allocated to South Inverness IN50 Land south of Asda

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

This area to be mostly designated as community land

Representation

It is unclear to me what retail units would be sited in this area given the close proximity of ASDA. There is already significant empty business space in the Inverness area including at Fairways, very close to this area, and it is difficult to understand who would benefit from such development other than the developers/builders. This land IN50 is already used by a significant number of people particularly dog walkers. The existing community land at IN60 now has a football pitch and is often not available for exercising dogs. In addition as a general rule it is not a good idea to mix football and dogs as despite many responsible dog owners, there is always dog mess on the the field and surrounding area. With the increasing number of houses in this area and the decreasing amount of open land more dog owners will need to drive to other suitable open areas to exercise their dogs thereby increasing the carbon footprint in a way that is avoidable by the retention of this land as mainly community.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Reduce/cancel application

Representation

The application does not clearly define the proportion of business, retail and community development, so it is hard to comment on such a vague proposal. However, whatever was built here would put further pressure on the dwindling open spaces used for recreation and dog walking. There is already an accumulation of dog mess along the cycle path and on the IN60 football field. With the increase in housing density, this will only get worse, as will the amount of litter. There is also a concern about litter and pollution from IN50 adversely affecting existing houses and the surrounding area, which was once a quiet secluded location and is now being encroached upon from all directions and losing its character.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The Notification letter regarding IN52 indicates that the Psychological Service Building is within the boundary (red) of this proposal. We should like this rectified as the building is a listed school building used for staff accomodation for the Pscyhological Service, meeting rooms and consulting rooms for parents, children and young people. It also contains staff parking - which is very important for a statutory, often peripatetic Council service.

Representation

We should therefore like the boundary redrawn to omit 11 - 13 Culcabock Avenue from within the site around Drakies House. Planners need to be aware of the very restricted access Culcabock Avenue would give to IN52. It is a narrow road, frequently congested with residential parting.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Deletion of site

Representation

Opposes further development in this area because: it would worsen existing traffic congestion, no feasible access route exists and it would worsen existing sewerage and surface water flooding problems.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

We would prefer lower density housing There is a lack of clarity over options for access

Representation

The site is a green wedge at present which is important in a residential setting and historic village It is attached to a listed building and development could detract from the attractiveness of the building You do not state how access is to be achieved except to say "no intensification of access to Old Perth Road". Does this allow for access off Culcabock Avenue? If so how would that be achieved?

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The development of this area IN52 must be accompanied by the safeguarding of all perimeter trees on Drakies Avenue and Culcabock Avenue, to protect the established residential amenity of many properties and to retain the well-established visual amenity of the area.

Representation

The policy makes no reference at all to the beautiful, long-established trees which adjoin housing in Culcabock and Drakies Avenues, and one would be forgiven for thinking the Authority has no objections to tree removal. If access is a critical element worth a mention (which indeed it is) then so is the safeguarding of the trees. It is imperative to set out these strict and vital criteria at the outset and not leave it open to discussion and negotiations later with a developer. Furher, on a matter of no inteerst to me, the notifcvation letter to me may be incorrecta nd others may want to have a good moan.... it erfers to the red area IN41 as "Notfiied Propsoed Developemnt Site" when in fact i adjoing IN52, as do my near neighbours. I wonder if there si an erroro here whiochs oemoen may capitalsie on; no need to rsepond on this...I am ahppy witht he btofictaion to me, for which many thnaks. Much appreciated.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The proposed plan takes insufficient account of the resultant serious impact on traffic and pedestrian safety. The developer should therefore review the Transport Assessment and fund traffic management solutions (eg traffic lights or speed-calming measures) specifically near the Drummond Road/Stratherrick junction.

Representation

This development will inevitably increase traffic on the surrounding roads. Since the completion of Sir Walter Scott Drive, traffic has increased on Drummond Road: drivers wishing to avoid the numerous roundabouts, use Drummond Road as a short cut to Westhill and environs. The road is difficult to negotiate – a sharp left-hand bend incorporates a right hand junction at which visibility is seriously reduced. There have already been 3 incidents of cars knocking down garden walls, including my own, sustaining serious damage on the Stratherrick Road side. In addition there is pavement on only one side of Drummond road necessitating many pedestrians to cross an increasingly busy road in order to walk safely. Increased numbers of speeding cars creates an unacceptable risk to pedestrians, especially those walking to the nearby local schools.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

The number of homes proposed is too high; would like to see a reduction

Representation

The number of homes proposed is 26. No supporting evidence for this number is provided. From the plan provided,, the apparent density of surrounding developments is much lower: 26 homes appears to be a substantially higher density development. It is hard to envisage how such a high density can be accommodated in such a small space, while addressing the very necessary stated requirements of access, setting, woodland, impact etc. The space currently provides a green space and a wildlife pathway between other green spaces (see aerial view). A much lower density development could mitigate adverse effects on these. The additional traffic and noise issues from such a high density development could also be considerable.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Constaints of: Woodland (including tree protection areas), a single point of access at a hazardous junction, exposed plateau microclimate, and protected features in terms of TPO and listed buildings: should all limit the development capacity.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

This is an area allocated for Business/Tourism potentially 26 homes in the IMFLDP. Lochardil and Drummond CC would like to object to the proposed house density. We appreciate that once the agricultural college moves to the Inverness Campus, the site could be redeveloped for housing. However the site is within a conservation area and contains a listed building, a lower density level of housing (and with low rise buildings) will be more in keeping with the area. The site has also a very restricted access to a busy road. The Community Council is concerned about the increased risk for pedestrians and cars that additional traffic from a development could cause. The Community Council considers that the proposed density does not take into account sufficiently the existing woodland and is concerned about the potential loss of trees particularly since most of the adjacent woodland has been recently lost to development.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

The density proposed can not be achieved without damage to the existing trees and the amenity of the area. Any development in the vicinity of a listed building should be sympathetically done so that the character and nature of the listed building is not adversely affected. A low density development, together with a flatted residential development of the listed building, should ensure a development in keeping with the area and ensure that no trees are felled. A low density development would also ensure that traffic to and from Stratherrick Road would not create danger, since this is a very busy road at times and traffic speed is at the maximum permitted and the road bend does not permit adequate sight lines. In addition the land is in a Conservation area and Tree Preservation orders are in force. This demands a low level development rather than cramming a high density development on the site in order to maximise profits. Low density development would also ensure that the roots of the existing trees were not damaged. Noted that a Development Brief is proposed but would recommend the inclusion of the Community Council and Robert Patton, the Councils Forestry Official as parties to this. Otherwise the Community Council would have to object to any site development. Not opposed to development of the site in principle but would propose new build should not exceed 13 houses. Previous plans for site development were opposed by the Community Council and the local community in 2006. The Community Council is also very much aware of the liberties that developers can take as in the case of the adjacent TPO area where a Reporter granted outline consent for two modest houses in the Scottish Tradition and the local Planning Office granted full consent for two enormous houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like the changes to take into consideration the location of a pub/restaurant and bulky goods from the houses.

Representation

I am seeking changes on the proposed plan for a number of reasons. I live right at the back and this development would be right on my back door step. If i had wanted to be in walking distance of a pub i would have moved in to the town centre. My 9 year old son had some very valid points that he wanted to make but got a little stage fright at the recent meeting. He said quite rightly that we have 3 pubs within walking distance already, The Fluke, The Raigmore Motel and Brewsters why do we need another. Another point he made was that his bedroom is at the back of the house and the noise that will come from the area will more than likely keep him awake a night and that he likes to have his window open and would no longer be able to do this. He stated "if he was kept awake at night he would not concentrate in school and probably wouldnt have a good day. " I think its unfair that my son is having to deal with these worries about his health and education due to a developer wanting to put another pub in the area. He also said that there would be a number of teens and young people who would be drinking and quite possibly swearing and that would have an influence on children in the area. I would also like to address in the change of class in the proposal initially it was class 10 which seems to have changed now to classes 1, 2 and 3? I find it unbelievable that Mr Crawford has said that we are looking forward to the development and we are welcoming it. Until last night I had not met Mr Crawford so I'm a little confused as to how he knew the opinions of myself and the other residents of Woodgrove. I havent even taken into consideration yet the damging effect this will have on the already high traffic levels in the area. I believe this proposal will have a detrimental effect on a well established quiet residential area. I think that the effects of this future proposal will bring higher crime rates that are quite possibly alcohol induced thus in turn causing an already busy police force to become further stretched. I am of the opinion that the developers need to concenrate on bringing our town centre up to a high standard considering we are supposed to be an idyllic tourist location, we seem to be falling far from the mark on this. The development would be far more well received if it actually took into consideration what the residents wanted. A Dell of Inshes Community Centre that gives our children and young people somewhere to meet and gain skills and attend activities would be far more appropriate in my opinion.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I am writing to object to the the proposed land use in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP), specifically the Dell of Inshes site, IN55.

Representation

The new IMFLDP proposes this site to be developed for class 10 usage, which would include community, retail (bulky goods only) and non residential institution, as adopted by the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP). I have not receiving any neighbour notification in relation to the proposed IMFLDP or HWLDP even though I live within 20m of the site IN55. To date I am also aware of 4 other neighbours who have not received notification. Any development on this site will increase traffic flow to the area which is already struggling, especially at peak times. The traffic loading at the Inshes roundabout has been at capacity for some time now as discussed at previous community consultation meetings in relation to the east – west link road, to help alleviate the congestion. As part of the 'Safer Routes' initiative there is yet to be provision for pedestrians and cyclists on and around the Inshes roundabout. The land currently acts as a buffer zone between the A9 and the houses in the Woodgrove/Briargrove housing scheme. This buffer zone allows for the reduction of road noise, vehicle fumes, light from car headlights and general lighting pollution, as well as providing a visual barrier. Development of this site would increase noise pollution from retail, delivery and servicing traffic, not to mention the increase in light pollution any development would bring. The recycling centre in Tesco car park already creates unacceptable early morning noise, development of this site would only compound this. The effects of lighting from Tesco shop frontage and it's car park can be clearly seen from my garden and bedroom windows. A development in direct line, would produce more significant noise and light pollution. As yet the Inshes area is still to be provided with a health/medical centre or day care centre as recommended by the current plan. The proposal for class 10 use will not guarantee any further services for community use as this allocation could simply just provide retail (bulky goods only). All such retail services required at a local level are already provided for by the current Inshes Retail Park. There is an alternative brown field site at Harry Ramsdens/Blockbuster location which is at best an eyesore as it stands. This would benefit from development of such required community services – namely a medical/health centre and at worse, would be better suited for retail use due to its further proximity to the local Dell of Inshes housing scheme. Milton of Leys is yet to be developed for local services and as yet has only been provided with a primary school and just this past week a Coop. This area would be better suited for further development as they are in desperate need of more local amenities and services than Inshes. I would urge the council to carefully consider the proposal for class 10 use of this site and encourage them to leave it as a buffer zone between the existing housing development and the A9. However, as the HWLDP shows this site is to be used for class 10 use, I would direct and encourage the council to develop this site for community use. For example, as allotments which are much sought after in the area. This would allow the land to remain as a buffer zone, be used for community use and reduce the effects that retail development would bring.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I object to the text as written for Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes. I seek an expansion of the plan text for Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes given the sites potential importance to realising the Planning Authority's bold ambition to link the A96, A9 and A82. I question the reasoning behind allocation the land for a specific purpose such as retail.

Representation

I seek an expansion of the plan text for Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes given the sites potential importance to realising the Planning Authority's bold ambition to link the A96, A9 and A82. It makes no sense to set out plans for the construction of a 'West Link', which did not achieve the support of the STPR outcome, in the IMFLDP, whilst seemingly giving insufficient weight in the plan text to Site IN55's importance to the construction of the eastern part (which was supported by the STPR) of the Trunk Link road. The Highland Council exhibited proposals for the 'Inverness Trunk Link Road' <http://www.highland.gov.uk/nr/ronlyres/4a4bcb6a-936a-4347-b593-3c71bdc409d7/0/itlrpresentation.pdf> and the proposals were described as, '...the central plank of the transport master plan for Inverness.' The exhibition also highlighted possible route options, and, whilst I do not agree with any options as presented, (what happens to any residents?) I feel there should be some further recognition in the text for this site in the IMFLDP.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

“Retail (bulky goods only)” should be deleted from the range of uses considered suitable for this site.

Representation

The site in question was previously promoted (just over 10 years ago) by the Kilmartin Property Group as being suitable for development, in particular for a bulky goods retail development. In 2004, the site was carefully considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry, Janet McNair. The Reporter rejected the site, saying it was not suitable for major development. At Paragraph 8.193 of her report, she commented as follows: “Notwithstanding the development that has already taken place and is planned in this area, the objection site would remain part of a swathe of largely undeveloped land along the west side of the A9. This land is clearly visible for a considerable distance on the decent in the City from the south, from where its tapering dimensions northwards draw the eye to this location. The retail park is set back from the road, beyond mature trees. While it is difficult to reconcile the permissions that have been granted for individual new houses with the unequivocal opposition to the development in Policy 2.41, these are at least domestic in scale. I conclude that, although detached from the extensive area of open land to the east of the A9, the land immediately to the east of the retail park makes a valuable contribution to the landscape setting of this main approach to the city. I conclude that it merits safeguarding from significant built development, such as the type of large-scale buildings likely to result from a retail warehousing allocation.” It is submitted that circumstances have not changed. This is not a site which should be developed for large-scale buildings and the comments of the Reporter, published in her Report in 2005, remain relevant and valid. In addition it is submitted that there is no requirement for the allocation of additional floorspace for bulky goods retailing at this stage. The Highland Council has previously indicated that it is minded to approve the proposed bulky goods retail park at Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park. The implementation of that development has been delayed due to current economic circumstances. However, once the bulky goods retail market returns to health, the IRBLP bulky goods floorspace will be able to respond to the demand. No other bulky goods retail park requires to be designated at this stage.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

We welcome the restriction to bulky goods identified in the description of this allocation. A recent application submitted to the Highland Council for this site is contrary to this restriction. This application seeks a relaxation to allow a flexible consent for retail uses, which has significant potential to have an adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of the City Centre. Whilst we welcome the restriction identified under the 'Uses' heading, we request that the restriction is reiterated under the 'requirements' heading. After 'transport assessment' please include: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Representation

We welcome the restriction to bulky goods identified in the description of this allocation. A recent application submitted to the Highland Council for this site is contrary to this restriction. This application seeks a relaxation to allow a flexible consent for retail uses, which has significant potential to have an adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of the City Centre. Whilst we welcome the restriction identified under the 'Uses' heading, we request that the restriction is reiterated under the 'requirements' heading. After 'transport assessment' please include: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Proposal IN55 should be solely community and or woodland use. IN55 should not include Retail (Bulky goods only) or Non-residential institution. In the requirements section the Council should incorporate the need to provide the community use provision for the area and maintain the green corridor along the A9. Additionally to the stated brief in the requirements section the Council should recognise the need to maintain and safeguard the vista at the gateway to the highland capital where north bound traffic enters Inverness. The stated proposal to prepare a masterplan / development brief to adopt as supplementary guidance must be prioritised as a request for planning permission in principle has been submitted, Ref 13/04334/PIP which seeks alternative use of IN55 and adjoining property. Furthermore identified need for but absence of supplementary guidance to address land safeguards for the various development factors and influences including the trunk and local road network including drainage improvements, flood risk assessments and transport assessments is sufficient cause to suspend all development planning applications in this area.

Representation

Proposal IN55 should be solely for community use and or woodland use. The current Greenspace entrance corridor into Inverness along the A9 will be eroded with retail development creating a break in entrance vista to the capital to the highlands. The first sight to any North bound traveller on the A9 will be a retail development cut into the natural landscape which is currently bounded with secluded hedges and woodland trees. This is contrary to the green wedge/network and community open space proposed with IN63 located adjacent to the upper Inshes/Milton of Leys developments. The map on page 33 highlights the negative effect IN55 will introduce as all other areas of existing woodland and agricultural land along the A9 South remain unaffected. Area IN55 provides a natural landscape boundary with tree lined perimeter to the existing retail development at Inshes. All properties in this area have secluded tree or woodland boundaries which softens the hard landscaping beyond. Visual screening cannot fully replace the intrusion into this open space. IN55 is contrary to planning policy to provide and maintain a green network for the trunk road network. IN55 also extends the Inshes retail zone between areas of existing residential use. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 1: There will be a loss of regional amenity to the portal vista on entrance to the capital of the highlands. 2: There will be a reduction of greenspace boundary and land safeguard around the trunk road network. 3: There will be a loss of protection to local plan greenspace and reduction of seclusion around existing residential properties. IN55 encroaches on previously decrefted land which has been protected by Green Wedge designation in previous local plan developments. The Highland-wide Local Development Plan (LDP), April 2012, introduced the change of land use to mixed use allocation for the area referred to as IN55 which is shown on the Inshes - Raigmore area map 4 in the HwLDP. IN55 will marginalise and enclose the existing residential properties located towards the North of the site. My home, Fernbank 7A Inshes Holdings is in the centre of this enclosed environment and will be surrounded by retail or commercial developments should the proposed local plan proposal change to IN55 be implemented. The amenity detriment to all the residential properties in this affected area will be significant where the area is largely rural in outlook with open outlooks South and adjacent woodland surrounding where wildlife prosper. Indeed there is a community of Roe deer which reside in the adjacent area along with water fowl and wading birds. The area is a wildlife sanctuary on the perimeter of the city and should be protected. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 4: The change in land use is contrary to previous local plan proposals. 5: There will be a significant loss of residential amenity with existing residential properties to the North of IN55 will be marginalised and enclosed with surrounding retail developments and road systems. 6: The existing wood and wetland wildlife sanctuary will be destroyed. Area IN55 is an open area with areas of wet marshy ground and low areas subject to frequent flooding. A raised berm has been previously constructed along the West boundary of the IN55 area to enclose an open drainage ditch. The ditch crosses under the culloden road embankment which is the North boundary to area IN55, in a twin circular culvert which on a number of recent occasions was unable to accommodate the water runoff which caused flooding and resulted in significant property damage to the adjacent retail development. The berm also prevents natural drainage from the entire area of area IN55 and all surface water runoff collects in the low lying area and extensive flooding results which also builds up into my property boundary. Indeed the impact from recent upstream residential developments appear to have contributed to the increased frequency of flooding in the drain and surrounding area. Any additional hard landscaping associated with the IN55 proposal will increase both the surface water runoff and the area flood risk noting the limited capacity downstream drainage system and ground soakaway capability. Any improvement to the culvert drain would require additional capacity to be provided noting the current design appears to be undersized. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 7: There will be an increase in flood risk to the existing residential properties and retail properties. 8: The engineering drainage capacity of the existing culvert drain to the North of IN55 would require to be

increased to accommodate any further increase in surface water runoff. Note this culvert is potentially under-designed for the current demand due to recent changes to the upstream catchment areas and any improvement may require replacement through the Culloden road embankment. Area IN55 does not require to provide retail (bulky goods) as there is extensive vacant provision at the Muirtown/Carse retail park the Inverness stoneyfield retail-park and at the Longman area. These existing brownfield sites should be redeveloped prior to consideration of greenfield areas. The IMFLDP should emphasise this approach and state the priority areas for development which should be based on demand and accessibility. Increased retail at Inshes will only increase the local traffic flow which is currently congested at peak times. The local road network and associated infrastructure including links and the need for segregation with the trunk road network must be assessed and a clear and forward looking plan implemented instead of the apparent current approach with developer led specific projects with no overall programme management. This apparent lack of an integrated development approach has led to piecemeal, disjointed and conflicting project development needs between developers and public funded organisation's. Indeed the IMFLDP stated proposal to prepare a masterplan / development brief to adopt as supplementary guidance must be prioritised as a request for planning permission in principle has been submitted, Ref 13/04334/PIP which seeks alternative use of IN55 and adjoining property. It is concerning that this PIP has been submitted when the IMFLDP remains to be endorsed and adopted and therefore the application should be rejected in the absence of the stated "Masterplan/ development brief" to act as supplementary guidance. Non-residential institution (Class 10) should be provided within the existing boundary of the Inshes development area where the demand can be justified and not within area IN55. There is no demand for provision of Non-residential institution development adjacent to the existing residential properties in the IN55 area. Any development of this nature would only increase the demand on drainage and road network as described previously. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 9: Retail development should be prioritised to vacant brownfield locations before consideration of greenfield sites. 10: The increase in retail traffic will only compound the current traffic congestion in the local and trunk road networks. The current road network cannot sustain further development without major infrastructure improvements due to localised traffic flow pinchpoints to and from the existing inshes retail and residential area. 11: There is no coherent integrated development plan to address current and future major infrastructure projects particularly the A9/A96 East link and how this affects area IN55. To complete the IMFLDP the trunk road improvements must be incorporated and future proofed. 12: Without a masterplan/development brief for area IN55 no development should be undertaken to prevent further application for planning permission such as has recently been submitted it this cannot be assessed for compliance with the IMFLDP proposal which is still not endorsed or adopted. 13: Non-residential institution (Class 10) should be provided within the existing boundary of the Inshes development area where the demand can be justified and not in the IN55 area. Any development of this nature would only increase the demand on drainage and road network as described previously.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Site bordered by Milburn Woods running down East of Old Perth Rd. This shows on OS Six Inch 1843-1882 map. Most adjoining areas already developed but further development of retail space planned. The NW corner of IN55 is currently green space but not safeguarded. If this is intended for development then adverse effect on AW must be avoided.

Representation

Please see previous comments on why ancient woodland is important.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

The site allocation is for mixed use and there is no justification or reasoning for specifying exact uses at this stage. The site is already identified in the HWLDP as mixed use and that plan states that a development framework will be produced for a wider area than the site now identified in the IMFLDP. The two plans are contradictory in wording and in site allocations. The IMFLDP should be consistent with the HWLDP and it is not. The site INF55 should be simply identified for mixed use as lying adjacent to the identified Inshes District Centre.

#### Representation

The IMFLDP should be consistent with the HWLDP. The site allocation at INF55 is not consistent with the HWLDP in that it specifies a restricted range of uses with no reasoned justification whereas the HWLDP coupled together with the saved policies of the Inverness Local Plan allow for a range of mixed uses and assessment of such uses against a broad range of policy criteria. There is no reasoned justification for identifying a restricted range of uses on this site. It is sufficient to identify the site for mixed use which would be compatible with the HWLDP. The reference to the development framework should be the same as that contained in the HWLDP as otherwise there is inconsistency in approach. The allocation is also inconsistent with the HWLDP as there is different wording relating to road improvements/drainage improvements contained in the HWLDP. None of the LDP documents indicate any specific proposals for trunk road improvements or drainage improvements in the Inshes area and as such it is not appropriate for a site specific land allocation in INF55 to specifically refer to such detailed issues in respect of one particular site where there is no indication on the proposals map or elsewhere in the plan which proposals are being referred to. The references to infrastructure works should be adjusted so as to be consistent with the HWLDP.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

1. Retain site back to Green Wedge of as a trust with a buffer between the A9 and Inshes Retail Park. 2. Department is aware of our concerns about a possible East Link on our home and land.

#### Representation

1. A vista in the City from the A9 down to the Raigmore Interchange. This site is not suitable as a retail centre as this will have a long term damage on this our area or a change for any other use.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I refer to the current farmland stretch of land from the Inshes retail park to the A9 (IN55) at the Dell of Inshes. The first question to be asked here is, has the correct procedure been followed from the changes of the Inverness Local Plan to the latest Inner Moray Firth Development Plan as I am aware that residents in the local area bordering the plan changes in Woodgrove Crescent, within 20/80 metres, have not been informed in writing from the council planning department as to the change from Green Wedge to mixed use. Firstly, there appears to be a planning application for development on the aforementioned stretch of previous green wedge land. As I am aware the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan has not yet been put into tablets of stone and therefore I suggest the council refuse permissions for any plan until such times the current development plan has been adopted due to procedural matters of protocol. Secondly, any development will have such an impact on the residents of Woodgrove Crescent and neighbouring houses that the amenity for local residents would vastly be damaged with respect to light pollution, noise at various times of the night and day and also have an impact on drainage as so protected by the planners own words with respect to the Inshes burn: 'there are flood problems associated with the Inshes burn. The farmland and afforested "buffers" towards the A9 must be secured. The current trees lining the burn act as a barrier for road and retail noise and that would be massively affected by any development mixed or other. The increase in traffic flow to and from any such proposed businesses in an already congested area , would add to child and general public safety, especially cyclists in an already established housing zone. There is preferential land available already for development, in front of currently, Harry Ramsdens which has no current development on the vacant land and would benefit from a community surgery perhaps. I would prefer the council to consider very carefully the land use area in question and remain mindful at all times of public safety and lack of amenity that any construction and development will have on the council tax payers in this particular area.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

“Retail (bulky goods only)” should be deleted from the range of uses considered suitable for this site.

Representation

The site in question was previously promoted (just over 10 years ago) by the Kilmartin Property Group as being suitable for development, in particular for a bulky goods retail development. In 2004, the site was carefully considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry, Janet McNair. The Reporter rejected the site, saying it was not suitable for major development. At Paragraph 8.193 of her report, she commented as follows: “Notwithstanding the development that has already taken place and is planned in this area, the objection site would remain part of a swathe of largely undeveloped land along the west side of the A9. This land is clearly visible for a considerable distance on the decent in the City from the south, from where its tapering dimensions northwards draw the eye to this location. The retail park is set back from the road, beyond mature trees. While it is difficult to reconcile the permissions that have been granted for individual new houses with the unequivocal opposition to the development in Policy 2.41, these are at least domestic in scale. I conclude that, although detached from the extensive area of open land to the east of the A9, the land immediately to the east of the retail park makes a valuable contribution to the landscape setting of this main approach to the city. I conclude that it merits safeguarding from significant built development, such as the type of large-scale buildings likely to result from a retail warehousing allocation.” It is submitted that circumstances have not changed. This is not a site which should be developed for large-scale buildings and the comments of the Reporter, published in her Report in 2005, remain relevant and valid. In addition it is submitted that there is no requirement for the allocation of additional floorspace for bulky goods retailing at this stage. The Highland Council has previously indicated that it is minded to approve the proposed bulky goods retail park at Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park. The implementation of that development has been delayed due to current economic circumstances. However, once the bulky goods retail market returns to health, the IRBLP bulky goods floorspace will be able to respond to the demand. No other bulky goods retail park requires to be designated at this stage.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Development should not be allowed on this side of the Torbreck Road. If development is permitted, it should be conditional on any building being constructed a minimum of 100 metres from existing buildings.

Representation

Further development should not be allowed beyond Torbreck Road which constitutes a natural and logical boundary to this area of Inverness. Any permitted development should be conditional on being constructed a minimum of 100 metres from existing buildings to prevent unnecessary crowding in a rural area.

Allocated to

---

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

(1) Change the allocation of IN57 from Community to Housing with a capacity for 5 to 8 houses. (2) Include the adjacent wooded margins of the Holm Burn and Drumdevan House within the Inverness City Settlement Development Area.

Representation

Our client, Freda Newton, owns a significant area of land surrounding Drumdevan House, south of Torbreck Road. We made previous submissions at the Call for Sites (Cfs) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages seeking low density housing on open land in a woodland setting within the Settlement Development Area (SDA). These submissions seem to have been given little weight and appear to have been treated inconsistently compared with those from other organisations and a government department for open land nearby. The reasons for not allocating it for low density housing are also not properly founded. Our client is therefore extremely disappointed that this land is not allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan. In addition, the identification of the largest part of this land for "Community" under IN57 has been undertaken without any explanation of this development potential or consultation and is unacceptable. We now seek the allocation of IN57 for housing to help meet the demand for such. Inclusion of the wooded setting of this land within the SDA will also help provide a more logical, definitive and defensible edge to the city boundary. We re-iterate some of the main principles of the previous submissions as follows: - (a) A suitable road access can be provided from the Torbreck road together with connections to public the sewer and water supply networks. (b) There are existing remote foot/cycle path connections from Holm Dell and Ness Castle offering opportunities for active travel and safe routes to school. (c) As the land is not shown as lying within the 1 in 200 years flood risk area there should be no need to undertake a flood risk assessment. (d) The wooded margins provide containment of the land in landscape terms and so will help integrate development and minimise intrusion on the Listed Drumdevan House. (e) It is less intrusive in the landscape than other comparably larger allocations. (f) Any buildings would be set back requisite distances from the Ness Castle/Holm House TPO and Semi-Natural/Ancient Woodland designation. (g) No part of the land is Prime quality agricultural land or part of a farm business unit. (h) With potential for more than 4 houses it will help deliver contributions to affordable housing in line with the Council's policies and towards improved education facilities. (i) It will also help meet the demand for low density housing development in a high quality wooded landscape setting on the edge of the city (precedent already set in this area) reducing pressure on the open countryside or Hinterland around Inverness. In the course of addressing objections to the Highland wide Local Development Plan, the Council stated that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". However, identification of the completely new and "preferred" MIR Housing Site Options H15 and H49 after the HwLDP Examination took place was completely at odds with this view. In one part of the response to our previous MIR submission on this land and the nearby land at Knocknagael (H15 in MIR), the Council continues to express the view that the need to allocate more land is not merited. In this regard it is stated that "there is no quantitative need to allocate additional housing land within or close to the City". Yet the Proposed Plan allocation of the Knocknagael land under IN32 is also clearly at odds with this view. In light of this we remain concerned about why this allocation is supported and expand on concerns in a separate objection to IN32. The Council's response continues: "These sites are located on the fringe of the City of Inverness but are not appropriate as a formal expansion of it given their small size and relatively long active travel distance from local facilities." Smaller scale development opportunities for lower density development within the SDA will help meet the demand for self-building. Few if any of the existing Local Plan allocations on the south side of the city have allowed for such demand to be met in recent years. Despite the recession which has affected the house building industry in recent years there is still a market for low density housing that would take some of the pressure off the countryside in the Hinterland around Inverness. There is also a shortage of large plots for high end of the market detached houses, replicating many of the properties built along Island Bank, Stratherrick Roads and in recent years on adjoining land at Drumdevan. Such provision would add to the choice of sites across the city as they are not expected to be available in the more conventional large scale medium density suburban expansion areas such as Ness Castle, Charleston, Slackbuie and Inshes. Other allocations are unlikely to offer such potential either with perhaps the exception of land at Milton of Ness-side (part of IN24), although individual plots may not be available in the more immediate future as this depends upon prior expensive servicing of intervening land. Most of the other allocations around the fringes of the city are also a relatively long active travel distance from local facilities at the present time. In considering the Drumdevan land for community uses reference is made to it as "less vital to the open green wedge aspect at this location and not subject to significant woodland and flooding constraints but would set an inappropriate precedent if developed for urban housing." However, we argue that for these very reasons it is suitable for housing, but not of a normal urban scale or density. A precedent has already been set in this area for low density urban fringe housing to the immediate south. The site lies

between this and the Holm Dell development and would effectively be an infill site. If the larger paddock is not subject to significant flooding constraints we also question that why there is a need to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment. In dismissing the housing development potential of our client's land it is very disappointing that the Council have deemed it for community use without a full explanation of the viability of this potential or discussion of this with the owner. The reference in the report on the MIR responses to "a previous proposal for a small private school at this location may be acceptable" seems to be a wishful allocation by officials without full research of the need for this and other community facilities in this area. No approach was ever made to the owner about such a proposal and we also understand that the existing private school has now closed as it was unviable. The only aspect we agree with is the need to account for shading from nearby trees to the west. However, this will not necessarily limit the footprint and mass of future buildings. The requirement to set back buildings from the Essich road frontage is not explained although it is probably not necessary to mention specifically as setbacks will be defined by retained boundary trees. In light of the above factors we feel the Council is not consistent in its assessment of our client's land compared to its continued support for IN32 through the stages of the LDP. In terms of the small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, identification of the land at Drumdevan for housing stands its own merits.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to



Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN58 Land at Gaelic Primary School Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Remove zoning from plan as inappropriate. Development on this site would be opposed by the Community Council and local community.

Representation

Land is part of Culduthel Park and covered by a Section 75 Agreement for public park. As such there is no need for a development zoning. If Highland Council wishes to form sports pitches or recreational areas on the land this would meet its obligations under the Section 75 Agreement and meet the needs of both the Community and the school, provided that the Community was given free access when not needed by school activities. As such there is no need for any development zoning . Any proposal for any building development on the site would be opposed by the Community and Community Council

Allocated to South Inverness IN58 Land at Gaelic Primary School

Customer Number 01058 Name Simpson Highview Ltd Organisation Simpson Highview Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Neil Gray Colliers Internatioinal

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 3.8

Reference Type Support Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Representation

Simpson Highview along with Mr and Mrs Grant have prepared a joint submission regarding how the Inshes District Park can be safeguarded. The landowners' support the need for safeguarding the park and wish to invest in its future. Please refer to the attached representation proposing a finish of the Park at Site Proposal IN61.

Allocated to South Inverness IN61 Inshes Park

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Our clients wish to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use.

Representation

Continued from previous Comment 1 Please find enclosed an indicative sketch layout showing details of the proposals for the site and how it can be delivered. The proposed development will incorporate a new access point to the site at the existing roundabout. This proposed access will be extended through the site to provide access to the consented 5 a-side sports complex and provide a formal entrance into the District Park. Parking provision will be provided at the site that will service the proposed community and commercial uses at the site. In addition this could also be utilised as over-spill parking for the sports complex and primary school. We believe this is of multiple-benefit to residents, visitors and to Highland Council in terms of delivering a solution to the matters outlined by the Council in the Main Issues Report response. In accordance with the Proposed Layout for the District Park we propose to provide boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. This will have the additional effect of 'rounding off' Inshes District Park and containing the parkland and its managed recreational open space within. An area for the provision for formal recreational activity will be provided, this may be classified within Class 10 or 11 of the Use Classes Order. This will enhance the amenity value of the site and comply with the Council's aspirations for the park. In order to enable these requirements to be achieved and assist the Council in delivering their proposals for Inshes District Park an element of commercial development will be required. We are proposing to include a 1,000 sq m commercial unit at the site. It is proposed that this unit can be used for Classes 2, 3, 4, 10 or 11 use. It could offer services relating to the proposed managed recreational open space such as indoor and outdoor sports or uses compatible with the existing surrounding land uses. We trust that the above comments will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the Local Development Plan and that the Council will allocate this site for commercial and community use. It would be appreciated that you contact either Neil Gray (Associate Director, Colliers International) or Kerri McGuire (Principal Planner, Graham and Sibbald) on the details provided, in the event that you wish to discuss these proposed changes to the Proposed Plan. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

For site reference IN 61 add "community/commercial" use allocation to land as indicated, lying to the north edge of Inshes Park.

Representation

With regard to 'South Inverness' Para 4.12-4.14 of the Proposed Plan. The south side of Inverness has seen considerable expansion. These new neighbourhoods place demands on the access to and use of open space, such as Inshes District Park. The landowner proposals for IN61 will assist Highland Council in completion of the north edge of Inshes District Park and help safeguard its long term existence. This meets the strategy set out for the South Inverness area. This is an approach by both landowners to demonstrate that the site (as per indicative masterplan) is a deliverable and viable commercial opportunity. The subject site lies vacant, positioned on the northern edge of Inshes District Park adjacent to Inshes Primary School. It presently offers no amenity value or economic benefit to the local area. It is not in the ownership of Highland Council who are leading the completion of Inshes District Park. We fully support the Council's proposals for Inshes District Park. However, this land has been allocated for community use/park use for a number of years without being delivered. We have undertaken a review of the Council's Proposed Layout for Inshes District Park. The proposals include the creation of access to the adjacent consented 5 a-side sports complex and boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. The remainder of the site has no specific requirement indicated in the Council's Proposed Layout, suggesting this will be utilised as open space. There is an opportunity to support the proposals for Inshes District Park by combining delivery of the Council's requirements for this site alongside delivery of the proposed commercial use in a complimentary fashion which does not impact on local residential amenity or detract from the parkland setting of this part of the District Park. It would offer a solution to Highland Council in enabling a formal entrance to the Park from the north edge, along with car parking for shared-needs and parkland boundary edge planting to 'finish off' the Park setting itself. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Both landowners previously promoted this site for commercial use at the Call for Sites and Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The site was not identified at the MIR as a preferred site for commercial use. In the assessment of the site at the MIR stage, the Council identified the commercial visibility of the site due to the nearby compatible uses. It was also identified that the site was flat and developable. The Council's concerns in relation to this site are due to loss of greenspace and the requirement for the creation of an entrance to the Inshes District Park. The Council also considers that there is restricted capacity of local road network. In terms of loss of greenspace, this site currently offers no amenity value and is not utilised by local residents. There have also been episodes of unlawful occupation of the site by travelling people. This representation puts forward a proposal that would allow the Council's aspirations for Inshes District Park to be delivered along with a commercial use at the site which is demonstrated in this submission to be compatible with the park land setting and benefit to the local and wider community. In terms of the restricted capacity of local road network, this site is in an easily accessible location that can be accessed by foot, cycle and public transport as well as private car. Given the small scale of the proposal and the proposed retail and commercial development at Inshes Retail Park, it is unclear why the capacity of the local road network is a particular concern for this site. The comments made to the proposed Lidl store by the Council's Roads Department did not indicate any capacity issues that would impact on the development of this site. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site R8 the Council states that: "The safeguarding and development of Inshes Park is a considerable achievement in working with the private developers and the community. However, the lack of suitable "gateway" entrance on its northern and most public frontage is a drawback which is why this land has been allocated as part of the Park for many years and successfully defended as such against alternative retail proposals at application/appeal. There has been no material change in circumstance since these decisions to justify a different approach. The respondent's claim of consolidating the City and allowing the expansion of the Inshes district centre are spurious given the availability of vacant land within the Inshes centre and in other commerce centres across the City. Matters of inadequate road capacity relate primarily to Inshes Roundabout and its associated junctions. It is accepted that the site access is adequate or can easily be made so. The site should be retained as allocated for community use – i.e. as an entrance to Inshes Park. Land to the north east comprising a wide road verge should be left as verge or be considered as part of wider proposals for improved parking, turning or drop off for the primary school." We have taken into considerations the comments the Council has raised in response to the representations submitted at the Main Issues Report stage. We fully recognise the importance of Inshes District Park and support the delivery of the park. We consider that there is an opportunity to ensure that this site can be developed to create an entrance to the park as well as providing commercial and community uses. The Proposed Plan zones the site as part of Inshes Park (Site IN61) for community use. The policy requirement details that the site should be developed in accordance with planning permission

07/00145/NIDIN. We request that this allocation is amended to allow for commercial and community use at this site. A Compatible Use at Inshes District Park The landowners recognise the key position the proposal site presents in relation to its location at the northern 'entrance' to the recently developed Inshes District Park. We are aware this has been a long-standing policy priority for Highland Council to provide the District Park, a key component of the Inshes and Milton of Leys community growth area plans for the south side of Inverness since the mid-1990's. We are also aware the District Park has been planned in a manner which seeks to offer visitors and residents a more rural 'country park' environment in the Milton of Leys area, utilizing its steeper topography and wooded landscape close to residents. Whereas in the Inshes area, particularly as one progresses north towards Sir Walter Scott Drive and transition into Inshes Retail Park, the Council's masterplan for the District Park aspires for a more formal parkland layout, including for "managed open space" and an element of "boundary screening" all of which are identified to be sited on the proposal land. In granting permission for the adjacent site for a five-a-side football facility, the officer report to Highland Council pointed to the compatibility of that proposed use compliant with the aims and objectives of creating the Inshes District Park. The landowners of this proposal site envisage the same compatibility and complementarity of development, in proposing a use or uses within Use Class 2,3,4, 10 or 11. Broadly the use would benefit the vision for "managed recreational open space" at this location of the Park; and may include activity such as organised physical activity offered to visiting members of the public. Proposals for the Subject Site The proposals submitted for the subject site seek to take all of the above matters relating to Inshes District Park into context. These include matters relating to: •compatibility of use with the District Park setting and proximity of the site to Inshes Primary School and the Southern Distributor Road; •Position of the proposed use relative to public access provision (on foot, cycle and by motor vehicle) into the northern entrance of Inshes District Park; •Types of use considered compatible with the site, its setting and potential function as a "managed recreational open space" for visiting members of the public. It is also relevant to comment that the proposals for the site must also be geared to bring commercial reality into the development proposals. The proposals will not be delivered in full by the landowners for the wider enjoyment of the community without an understanding that private investment may only be sustained by commercial value returned to the development. Therefore the proposals also bring an ancillary use with a higher commercial value into the site. The landowners of this site have taken into consideration the comments made by the Council at the previous consultation stages of the Local Development Plan and also the reasons for refusal of the Lidl proposal. We have also recognised the importance of Inshes District Park and that the delivery of this Park is a key priority for The Highland Council. We have prepared a proposal that we consider will assist the Council in delivering their aspirations for the park as well as providing commercial and community uses that will be of benefit to the local community. The site currently offers no amenity value or function and these proposals are an opportunity to bring the site into economic use, create employment opportunities and assist the Council in meeting their aspirations for the delivery of the District Park. Increasing sustainable economic growth is the stated overarching purpose of the Scottish Government. SPP advises at paragraph 45 that authorities should '... respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors and sizes of businesses and take a flexible approach to ensure that the changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential'. In particular it advises that the planning system should support economic development in all areas by, amongst other things: • 'Promoting development in sustainable locations, particularly in terms of accessibility supporting development which will provide new employment opportunities and enhance local competitiveness". Please find enclosed an indicative sketch layout showing details of the proposals for the site and how it can be delivered. The proposed development will incorporate a new access point to the site at the existing roundabout. This proposed access will be extended through the site to provide access to the consented 5 a-side sports complex and provide a formal entrance into the District Park. Parking provision will be provided at the site that will service the proposed community and commercial uses at the site. In addition this could also be utilised as over-spill parking for the sports complex and primary school. We believe this is of multiple-benefit to residents, visitors and to Highland Council in terms of delivering a solution to the matters outlined by the Council in the Main Issues Report response. In accordance with the Proposed Layout for the District Park we propose to provide boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. This will have the additional effect of 'rounding off' Inshes District Park and containing the parkland and its managed recreational open space within. An area for the provision for formal recreational activity will be provided, this may be classified within Class 10 or 11 of the Use Classes Order. This will enhance the amenity value of the site and comply with the Council's aspirations for the park. In order to enable these requirements to be achieved and assist the Council in delivering their proposals for Inshes District Park an element of commercial development will be required. We are proposing to include a 1,000 sq m commercial unit at the site. It is proposed that this unit can be used for Classes 2, 3, 4, 10 or 11 use. It could offer services relating to managed recreational open space such as indoor and outdoor sports (excluding motor sports and sports involving firearms) and be complemented by ancillary services to visiting members of the public.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN61	Inshes Park	
--------------	-----------------	------	-------------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Our clients wish to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use.

Representation

Following on from our pervious comments, we have prepared an indicative completed site plan and indicative landscape plan to demonstrate how the commercial/community uses can be delivered at the site.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Community Park. Continued planting supporting as AW on either side of park.

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Our client wishes to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use.

Representation

This is a joint submission prepared by the above landowners' agents Colliers International and Graham and Sibbald. The submission of these representations presents a joint approach by both landowners to demonstrate that the site (as per attached red line boundary and indicative masterplan) is a deliverable and viable commercial opportunity. The proposed development of the site can assist the Council in achieving their aspirations for Inshes District Park. Our clients wish to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use in the emerging Local Development Plan. The subject site lies vacant, positioned on the northern edge of Inshes District Park and adjacent to Inshes Primary School. It presently offers no amenity value or economic benefit to the local area and it is not in the ownership of Highland Council who is leading the completion of Inshes District Park. Our clients fully support the Council's proposals for Inshes District Park. However, this land has been allocated for community use/park use for a number of years without being delivered. We have undertaken a review of the Council's Proposed Layout for Inshes District Park. The proposals for this area of land include the creation of access to the adjacent consented 5 a-side sports complex and boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. The remainder of the site has no specific requirement indicated in the Council's Proposed Layout, suggesting this will be utilised as open space. We consider that there is an opportunity to support the proposals for Inshes District Park by combining delivery of the Council's requirements for this site alongside delivery of the proposed commercial use in a complimentary fashion which does not impact on local residential amenity or detract from the parkland setting of this part of the District Park. It would offer a solution to Highland Council in enabling a formal entrance to the Park from the north edge, along with car parking for shared-needs and parkland boundary edge planting to 'finish off' the Park setting itself. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Both landowners previously promoted this site for commercial use at the Call for Sites and Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The site was not identified at the MIR as a preferred site for commercial use. As detailed in both parties' comments submitted at the MIR consultation stage, this site was promoted for commercial use (retail, commercial, business or leisure). In the assessment of the site at the MIR stage, the Council identified the commercial visibility of the site due to the nearby compatible uses. It was also identified that the site was flat and developable. The Council's concerns in relation to this site are due to loss of greenspace and the requirement for the creation of an entrance to the Inshes District Park. The Council also considers that there is restricted capacity of local road network. In terms of loss of greenspace, this site currently offers no amenity value and is not utilised by local residents. There have also been episodes of unlawful occupation of the site by travelling people. This representation puts forward a proposal that would allow the Council's aspirations for Inshes District Park to be delivered along with a commercial use at the site which is demonstrated in this submission to be compatible with the park land setting and benefit to the local and wider community. In terms of the restricted capacity of local road network, this site is in an easily accessible location that can be accessed by foot, cycle and public transport as well as private car. The proposals put forward in this representation and the submitted indicative layout will be for the benefit of the surrounding local residents. Given the small scale of the proposal and the proposed retail and commercial development at Inshes Retail Park, it is unclear why the capacity of the local road network is a particular concern for this site. The comments made to the proposed Lidl store by the Council's Roads Department did not indicate any capacity issues that would impact on the development of this site. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site R8 the Council states that: "The safeguarding and development of Inshes Park is a considerable achievement in working with the private developers and the community. However, the lack of suitable "gateway" entrance on its northern and most public frontage is a drawback which is why this land has been allocated as part of the Park for many years and successfully defended as such against alternative retail proposals at application/appeal. There has been no material change in circumstance since these decisions to justify a different approach. The respondent's claim of consolidating the City and allowing the expansion of the Inshes district centre are spurious given the availability of vacant land within the Inshes centre and in other commerce centres across the City. Matters of inadequate road capacity relate primarily to Inshes Roundabout and its associated junctions. It is accepted that the site access is adequate or can easily be made so. The site should be retained as allocated for community use – i.e. as an entrance to Inshes Park. Land to the north east comprising a wide road verge should be left as verge or be considered as part of wider proposals for improved parking, turning or drop off for

the primary school.” We have taken into considerations the comments the Council has raised in response to the representations submitted at the Main Issues Report stage. We fully recognise the importance of Inshes District Park and support the delivery of the park. We consider that there is an opportunity to ensure that this site can be developed to create an entrance to the park as well as providing commercial and community uses. The Proposed Plan zones the site as part of Inshes Park (Site IN61) for community use. The policy requirement details that the site should be developed in accordance with planning permission 07/00145/NIDIN. We request that this allocation is amended to allow for commercial and community use at this site.

A Compatible Use at Inshes District Park The landowners recognise the key position the proposal site presents in relation to its location at the northern ‘entrance’ to the recently developed Inshes District Park. We are aware this has been a long-standing policy priority for Highland Council to provide the District Park, a key component of the Inshes and Milton of Leys community growth area plans for the south side of Inverness since the mid-1990’s. We are also aware the District Park has been planned in a manner which seeks to offer visitors and residents a more rural ‘country park’ environment in the Milton of Leys area, utilising its steeper topography and wooded landscape close to residents. Whereas in the Inshes area, particularly as one progresses north towards Sir Walter Scott Drive and transition into Inshes Retail Park, the Council’s masterplan for the District Park aspires for a more formal parkland layout, including for “managed open space” and an element of “boundary screening” all of which are identified to be sited on the proposal land. In granting permission for the adjacent site for a five-a-side football facility, the officer report to Highland Council pointed to the compatibility of that proposed use compliant with the aims and objectives of creating the Inshes District Park. The landowners of this proposal site envisage the same compatibility and complementarity of development, in proposing a use or uses within Use Class 2, 3, 4, 10 or 11. Broadly the use would befit the vision for “managed recreational open space” at this location of the Park; and may include activity such as organised physical activity offered to visiting members of the public.

Proposals for the Subject Site The proposals submitted for the subject site seek to take all of the above matters relating to Inshes District Park into context. These include matters relating to:

- compatibility of use with the District Park setting and proximity of the site to Inshes Primary School and the Southern Distributor Road;
- Position of the proposed use relative to public access provision (on foot, cycle and by motor vehicle) into the northern entrance of Inshes District Park;
- Types of use considered compatible with the site, its setting and potential function as a “managed recreational open space” for visiting members of the public.

It is also relevant to comment that the proposals for the site must also be geared to bring commercial reality into the development proposals. The proposals will not be delivered in full by the landowners for the wider enjoyment of the community without an understanding that private investment may only be sustained by commercial value returned to the development. Therefore the proposals also bring an ancillary use with a higher commercial value into the site. The landowners of this site have taken into consideration the comments made by the Council at the previous consultation stages of the Local Development Plan and also the reasons for refusal of the Lidl proposal. We have also recognised the importance of Inshes District Park and that the delivery of this Park is a key priority for The Highland Council. We have prepared a proposal that we consider will assist the Council in delivering their aspirations for the park as well as providing commercial and community uses that will be of benefit to the local community. The site currently offers no amenity value or function and these proposals are an opportunity to bring the site into economic use, create employment opportunities and assist the Council in meeting their aspirations for the delivery of the District Park. Increasing sustainable economic growth is the stated overarching purpose of the Scottish Government. SPP advises at paragraph 45 that authorities should ‘... respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors and sizes of businesses and take a flexible approach to ensure that the changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential’. In particular it advises that the planning system should support economic development in all areas by, amongst other things: • ‘Promoting development in sustainable locations, particularly in terms of accessibility supporting development which will provide new employment opportunities and enhance local competitiveness’.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN61	Inshes Park	
--------------	-----------------	------	-------------	--

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

We are concerned that the planning permission of site IN63 may result in unnecessary development, inappropriate development, as well as posing a threat to badger setts resident in area.

Representation

The site adjacent to Braes of Balvonie has been designated for "community" use. Many residents are concerned that this site will be developed --unnecessarily & needlessly -- simply because it is available. Many residents would contend that its current use, as productive agricultural land, is a good use. Agricultural land, once developed, is rarely or never returned to agricultural use. Secondly, we are concerned that any development of this site may not be in keeping with the "green wedge" philosophy under which it was originally zoned. The green wedge was overridden by the current development for the Housing Expo. We would be concerned that further encroachment of the green wedge would diminish the natural habitat. We are concerned for the well-being of a badger sett which has been observed and filmed on this site. We also note that the site is habitat for deer and would conclude on this basis that it is a transportation path for wildlife generally. Further, we are concerned by initiatives to develop this site as a for-profit private development, under the guise of "community use". To date we have been approached by "community developers" from outwith the area, and have been subject to date of their wish to impose their vision for the site onto residents. We believe this is anathema to the concept of "community" use, and would suggest the Council take a conservative approach to any development of this site. We would favour, if pushed, a 'grass-roots' development, and not something imposed by those living outside the area, who are in any case, unlikely to ultimately be users of the site due to distance, etc. We note that parents at Milton of Leys school have indicated to us that they would not permit their children to use recreation facilities at the IN63 site, as it is simply too far from their homes, and they would not wish their children to travel that far. We would suggest that the proximity of the A9 may have a negative impact in at least two ways: by posing a danger to site users, and by introducing an undesirable element. With potential site users occupying facilities unobserved by anyone, the capacity for anti-social behaviour is high and would be expected. Lastly, the Highland Council Ward Manager for this area has confirmed that any recreational or similar development at the site WOULD NOT be maintained by Highland Council. We therefore believe it would be foolish to invest in infrastructure in the case where a private body would have to be funded in perpetuity to ensure maintenance of the site.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the above site.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Delete the part of the Drakies/SDR buffer south of the former Northern Constabulary HQ from the general Raigmore/Beechwood business allocation. Re-allocate for open space. Possibly also re-appraise the identification of Raigmore Hospital as a business use.

Representation

This part of the long established Drakies/SDR buffer was only included in previous local plans to allow relocation of the Police HQ playing field if expansion of the operations building over the old playing field was proposed. With the establishment of Police Scotland and the redundancies that the merger process gave rise to it is highly unlikely that further expansion of Police office and other operations accommodation will be required. Inclusion of this open land and the high amenity trees on its north side are therefore at odds with most of the rest of the area covered by the proposed business allocation. There is also no capacity in the Old Perth Road residential slip road and Inshes roundabout leg serving Drakies to take more traffic from expansion of the former Police HQ. I also question why Raigmore Hospital is allocated as part of a Business area when it is clearly more aligned with "community" uses. If a masterplan/development brief is to be prepared for the IN65 area it must address the constant rat-running along the Old Perth Road residential slip road serving Drakies by traffic seeking to avoid the traffic lights at the hospital junction. This has been a problem for many years and impacts upon the amenity of adjacent residents as well as being a danger to school children walking and cycling to and from Millburn Academy. This problem exists despite an access restriction order being in place for a long time as it is never enforced by the Police. Indeed many of the "offending" drivers are those making journeys that either start or end at the former Police HQ.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Our client supports the allocation of the northern section of their site for business use (allocation IN65). Our client requests that this business use allocation is extended as far as the existing open space land at Sir Walter Scott Drive

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mr and Mrs Grant, who own the land at Sir Walter Scott Drive, Inshes, Inverness which is partially zoned for business use (Proposed Plan Site IN65). Our client fully supports the allocation of the northern section of this site for business use. However, we object to the allocation of the southern section of the site as open space. We request that the business allocation is extended as far as the existing open space land at Sir Walter Scott Drive. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Our client previously promoted this site for commercial use at the Call for Sites and Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The site was not identified at the MIR as a preferred site for commercial use. At the Main Issues Report the Council suggested this site was put forward for retail purposes. The site was promoted at this stage for a range of commercial uses rather than purely retail use. The Council recognised that the site is flat and developable. The Council also stated that the site was commercially visible. The concerns raised against the allocation of the site included the loss of greenspace, loss of Policy HQ expansion safeguard and restricted capacity of the local roads network. Our client fully supported the allocation of the northern part of the site for the expansion of the Police HQ and did not seek the removal of this safeguarding allocation. The Council has recognised that the open space at this location provides no amenity value. In terms of the capacity of the local roads network, this site is located in a highly accessible location that can be reached on foot, cycling and public transport. Furthermore, the Council has allocated the northern section of the site for business use and has not raised any concerns in relation to roads capacity for this part of the site. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site R7 the Council states that: "Land to south of the Drakies Police HQ has been safeguarded for its expansion for several years. Police Scotland advised that this land is still required at least as an option for expansion of justice and/or other public services at this location. The land may also be required in connection with the reconfiguration of Inshes roundabout and use taking access off it. The land presently performs an amenity function and buffer to the distributor road but is not high quality useable public space. An expanded Policy HQ could provide sound and visual barrier between Drakies houses and the distributor road. There is adequate retail land provision in and adjoining existing centres. Extending Inshes Retail Park across a principal distributor road would not be appropriate. It is therefore appropriate to retain the status quo in terms of the site's planning status." We fully support the allocation of the northern section of this site for expansion of the Police HQ or other public services. We also fully agree with the Council's assessment that the existing open space is not high quality useable public space. To clarify, our client is not suggesting that the Inshes Retail Park is extended across the distributor road. We consider that this site should be allocated for business use as an extension to the allocation for the Police HQ expansion. The Council states that this land may be required in connection with the reconfiguration of Inshes roundabout. If this land is required for this purpose we request that the Council enters into early discussions and negotiations with our client. If the Council continues to allocate this as open space to ensure it can be used for potential roundabout improvements in the future, this is blighting any possible commercial use of the site. The northern section of the site is allocated for business use under Site Reference: IN65 Land at Raigmore/Beechwood. The requirements associated with this allocation state that: "The Council will produce a masterplan/development brief which it will adopt as Supplementary Guidance. This will address: the need for completion of and/or land safeguards for, improvements to the trunk road and local road networks prior to development: land safeguard for drainage improvements/safeguards; Flood Risk Assessment (may affect developable area); transport assessment." We request that our client, as landowner, is consulted during the preparation of the masterplan/development brief. Planning Justification for the Allocation of the Site The southern section of this site remains allocated as open space. The site currently offers no amenity value and is not utilised by local residents. The Council has recognised in their response to the Main Issues Report consultation, that this land is not high quality useable public open space. The land is therefore not serving a function as open space. We therefore request that the site boundary of the allocated business site is extended as far as the existing open space land at Sir Walter Scott Drive. This will provide flexibility for the expansion of the Policy HQ and for the provision of other public services. It will also provide flexibility in the business land supply for Inverness should Police Scotland determine that they no longer require the site. We trust that the above comments will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the Local Development Plan and that the Council will extend the business allocation at this location. As the landowner, we

request that our client is fully consulted and involved in any Development Brief prepared for this site. If the Council requires this land for enhancements to Inshes Roundabout we request that they enter into early discussions and negotiations with our client.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

#### Comment Changes

IN67 (Bogbain East) is shown split up into three areas on the Proposals Map, with all three areas being allocated for Business. Inverness Estates wishes to see the following changes made to the Proposed Plan: The use of the eastern area and the use of part of the north western area should be re-defined as being suitable for business, tourist related development, and commercial leisure. The remainder of the north western area and the whole of the southern area should be allocated for residential development.

#### Representation

The relevant land is allocated in the adopted local plan for business and commercial use. The original justification for designating such a huge amount of land, at this location, for business and commercial use is now unclear. It is possible to understand why it may have been seen as a suitable location for some exceptional uses (such as a film studio) but in terms of general business development it is a poor location with more locational disadvantages than advantages. During the past decade, the owners of the site have tried, without success, to market the site for business/commercial development. These attempts to attract development have involved both local and national agents, as well as the services of Scotland Development International and Highlands & Islands Enterprise. In support of this representation we attach a letter from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1). This represents an independent assessment of why there has been no interest in business development at Milton of Leys, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. A copy of the marketing details prepared in 2011 by SDI and HIE is also attached, for information (Doc 2). There has been not market interest. The owners of the land therefore require to consider alternative development options for the land in question. Having reviewed the options, the changes set out in Section 4 are requested. An indicative development framework, previously submitted at the Main Issues Report and Call for Sites stages is attached (Doc 3). This shows the way in which the changes sought in Section 4 above might be implemented.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

IN67 (Bogbain East) is shown split up into three areas on the Proposals Map, with all three areas being allocated for Business. Inverness Estates wishes to see the following changes made to the Proposed Plan: The use of the eastern area and the use of part of the north western area should be re-defined as being suitable for business, tourist related development, and commercial leisure. The remainder of the north western area and the whole of the southern area should be allocated for residential development.

Representation

The relevant land is allocated in the adopted local plan for business and commercial use. The original justification for designating such a huge amount of land, at this location, for business and commercial use is now unclear. It is possible to understand why it may have been seen as a suitable location for some exceptional uses (such as a film studio) but in terms of general business development it is a poor location with more locational disadvantages than advantages. During the past decade, the owners of the site have tried, without success, to market the site for business/commercial development. These attempts to attract development have involved both local and national agents, as well as the services of Scotland Development International and Highlands & Islands Enterprise. In support of this representation we attach a letter from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1). This represents an independent assessment of why there has been no interest in business development at Milton of Leys, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. A copy of the marketing details prepared in 2011 by SDI and HIE is also attached, for information (Doc 2). There has been not market interest. The owners of the land therefore require to consider alternative development options for the land in question. Having reviewed the options, the changes set out in Section 4 are requested. An indicative development framework, previously submitted at the Main Issues Report and Call for Sites stages is attached (Doc 3). This shows the way in which the changes sought in Section 4 above might be implemented.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

A9 junction is currently unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles as was demonstrated in a subject matters experts report compiled by a local resident.

Representation

This would create an eyesore on the approach to the Highland Capital. The increase in traffic cutting through Milton of Leys to access this business site is a safety concern for a residential area with a large Primary school. The planned West Link road will exacerbate this issue, as vehicles already use Milton of Leys to bypass the struggling Inshes road layout.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

AW on S border. Buffering required. Pleased to see plan in principle includes protection of existing woodland and additional tree planting.

Representation

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

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

No development at this site, leave it as a natural green space to benefit the local residents and wildlife.

Representation

IN67 is identified as a natural green space by the Highland Greenspace Audit. Policy 75 of the HwLDP states that such sites will be safeguarded unless; a) it can be suitably demonstrated that the open space is not fit for purpose. b) substitute provision will be provided meeting the needs of the local area c) development of the open space would significantly contribute to the spatial strategy of the area. IN67 does not fulfill (a) b) the needs of the local people and wildlife are access to natural Greenspace. We do not wish you to substitute what we have. The development along the edge of General Wades Road has already had significant negative effect on the wildlife in this corridor. I particularly notice the decline in bird life including yellowhammers (a bird on the red list of conservation concern). To extend development further up this corridor will have a large negative impact on wildlife. Especially as the proposed area includes wetland and bog - a type of land fantastic for biodiversity and poor for building on. c) I cannot believe that this area would be key for spatial strategy, being on the edge of development. Please leave this area alone and give us all, people and wildlife, room to breathe!

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Rejection of the proposed development at this site.

Representation

I wish to object to the proposal for site IN68 at Culduthel Avenue for Retail units as contained in the planning application 09/00074/FULIN. The application and proposal provide for neighbourhood shops on this site, but the absence of any development since the application was approved in September 2010 demonstrate that the plan was and remains a folly. Since then of course Tesco and Asda have opened large stores less than a mile from site IN68 and a small number of retail operations have opened at Fairways. The Asda development contains empty retail units and Tesco at Holm is not busy. Clearly then there is little demand from the neighbourhood for additional retail facilities on top of Asda and Tesco, and any demand there was has probably been satisfied at Fairways. Equally clearly there is no appetite from retailers to pursue speculative endeavours with competition from national operations in such close proximity. The deficits in the original plan were pointed out by myself and others such as Lochardil and Drummond Community Council and included inadequate traffic and parking arrangements and the industrial design of the units which are out of character with the locality and to my mind contrary to the Local Plan at that time. While the application that was approved was for four retail units, the original application included a fast food unit. I have no doubt that the developer will continue to attempt to establish such a facility on the site which would severely compromise the amenity of the adjoining Lochardil woodland and undermine healthy eating efforts at the nearby Inverness Royal Academy. The Lochardil woodland is a fantastic and very popular amenity and I would encourage the Council to seek to maintain and enhance that facility and access to it rather than pursue a retail option that was never viable and is now clearly redundant.

Allocated to



Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

I would like the development allocation for IN71 changed to not allow retail development of the site retail.

Representation

The site marked IN71 should not be allocated for retail use for a number of reasons: 1. Policy 1 (page 13) states that Council "will not support any proposal for development that is likely to have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of any of the centres listed below"... these include Inverness City Centre and Inshes Retail Park. These areas would be at risk of losing business if retail development is allowed at IN71. Furthermore within 500m of IN71 there several established retail outlets. In addition there are more retail outlets currently under development at Wester Inshes (IN70) and Milton of Leys (IN72). Less than 1 mile from IN71 there are several major retail chains and a more under development at the Inshes Retail Park and IN69 (Asda). 2. Parking, vehicular access and pedestrian safety are further reasons that the proposed development allocation for IN71 is not appropriate. IN71 is a small site which offers a limited area for development, car parking and access. There are currently no footpaths on Old Edinburgh Road South which a single track road, very popular with cyclists and pedestrians of all ages. Increased car activity to and from any development on this site creates a safety risk. Recent residential developments at Parks Farm and Milton of Leys have been linked by footpaths to Old Edinburgh Road South to encourage pedestrian usage. This has been successful and has led to a significant increase in numbers of pedestrians and cyclists for which there are no safe paths to avoid the traffic. Further development at IN71 at this critical junction will increase safety risks for these road users. It is my view that if a retail development were built on this small site, cars would park on the existing roads increasing risks to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. A further consideration is that Old Edinburgh Road South is still designated with a 60mph speed limit adjacent to IN71. 3. "One of the main elements of the strategy for the Inner Moray Firth is to focus attention on the area's town and local centres to bolster their role as well connected meeting places and as hubs for local facilities." The development allocation IN71 appears to be piecemeal development of residual land. It does not sit well within an overall co-ordinated plan. 4. Old Edinburgh Road South is currently a poorly maintained single track road with inadequate surface drainage. Frequently after a heavy downpour, significant volumes of surface water affect the road at the location of IN71. 5. Old Edinburgh Road South is the only access for a number of working farms and large farm vehicles frequently use this road. Further development at the entry to this road would create issues for these vehicles, local residents, other road users and visitors to any development on IN71. I object to the piecemeal development allocation of IN71 as I believe there are sufficient retail opportunities offered with the appropriate level of services and infrastructure within close proximity to it. Furthermore development at this site creates significant road safety issues.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

The site is too small for shop & parking. It is at a junction of a busy Rd ,Stevenson Rd & single track Old Edinburg Rd with potential safety problems. There has been recent provision for more shops in the area & these are readily accessible for residents. The need is no longer there.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Dereck MacKenzie. Our client owns the land at Old Edinburgh Road, Inverness that is identified for retail use (Allocations IN71). Our client fully supports the continued allocation of this site for retail use. The site is allocated in the Proposed Plan as a 0.3 hectare site for Retail use. The policy requirements associated with this allocation state that the site is only suitable for neighbourhood catchment scale facility and that improved access off Old Edinburgh Road South is required. Our client fully supports the continued allocation of this site. Given the size of the site we agree with the Council's requirement that this site is development for a neighbourhood catchment scale of retail development.

Allocated to

Customer Number  Name  Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section  Paragraph

Reference  Type  Comment Late

Comment Changes

We consider that retail use designation for the development site identified as IN71 is unsuitable and therefore should be changed.

Representation

I object to the proposed retail development at IN71 on the following grounds: • The shape and location of the site, coupled to its close proximity to the junction of Old Edinburgh Road South and Stephenson Drive, dictates that any off road parking and goods deliveries will have to be accessed off the foot of Old Edinburgh Road South. We consider that Old Edinburgh Road South is unsuitable for access to the development due to a number of factors. The existing road provides vehicle access to a small number of residential properties and farm buildings only, however is very popular with walkers, cyclists and runners all year round. Pedestrian links to residential developments at Parks Farm and Milton of Leys, designed to encourage non car travel into town have been very successful. However the road is only of single track, is poorly maintained and has inadequate surface drainage provision and no lighting. In addition there is no footpath provision anywhere on the road and currently is designated with a 60 mph speed limit. Due to the confined nature of the road there is no capacity to provide a safe footpath and therefore to increase vehicular traffic, whilst also encouraging additional foot traffic by provision of a retail outlet must be rejected on safety grounds. • Every day we witness drivers parking unsafely on the corner of Stephenson Drive/ Old Edinburgh Road South to access the existing corner post-box. This causes traffic obstructions and creates blind spots for their own convenience. We are extremely concerned, however would fully expect to see higher volumes of drivers parking on Stephenson Drive to access the retail development rather than drive off road to access any on-site parking. Again, on the grounds of safety the retail development designation of this site should be changed. • The Council states within the Development Plan that they “will not support any proposal for development that is likely to have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of any of the centres listed below”, including Inverness City Centre and Inshes Retail Park. Given the close proximity, the proposed development will certainly impact upon the Inshes Retail Park.

Allocated to