

The Highland Council
City of Inverness Area Committee – 12 August 2013

Agenda Item	6a
Report No	CIA/38/13

Torvean and Ness-Side Development Brief

Report by Director of Planning and Development

Summary

This report outlines responses to the public consultation on the draft Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief. This planning policy document is required to guide the completion of two of the City's residential expansion areas and to co-ordinate land use and transport provision in Inverness.

Members are asked to finalise the Brief content by approving amendments (detailed in **Appendix 1**).

Subject to a related Council decision the finalised Brief will then be a material planning consideration and subsequently adopted as part of the Council's statutory development plan.

1. Introduction and Context

- 1.1. Successive Council development plans have earmarked land at Ness-side and Charleston as City expansion areas because the land is relatively free of constraints and close to existing and proposed facilities. This was re-affirmed through the adoption of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan (2012), which sets the principle of development of these lands and requires the production of detailed guidance for the area.
- 1.2. A draft Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief ("the Brief") was agreed by the City of Inverness and Area Committee on 15th April 2013.
- 1.3. A public consultation on the Brief and related projects ran from 16th April until 31st May 2013. This included three consultation events at Kinmylies Church (17th April), Culduthel Christian Centre (18th April) and Eastgate Centre (4th May). Attendance was excellent with over 500 people visiting the exhibitions.

2. Responses Received

- 2.1. Around forty respondents have made written comments specific to the Brief and these are summarised in detail in **Appendix 1** and recorded verbatim on the Council's web-site as **Appendix 2** to this report. As expected, there is a degree of overlap between comments received on the three consultations (West Link, the Brief and the Sports Hub / Golf Course Reconfiguration). The other reports to this Committee cover non Brief comments.

- 2.2. Immediate **neighbours** have highlighted localised issues of surface water drainage, privacy, overlooking, flood risk, road access and public sewer connectivity.
- 2.3. **Landowners and developers** seek Brief amendments to address: excessive and unjustified developer contributions; reduced developable areas and therefore development value and viability; the need to avoid any further delay in progressing West Link; the housing capacity figures stated in the Brief as being too low; the disputed need for high specification roads internal to housing areas; the need for the Council to co-ordinate infrastructure provision and ensure equitable developer costs and values; the need for earlier phasing of development sites; the need for higher value uses, and; the adverse effects of public access at Ness-side.
- 2.4. **Other City residents, public agencies and interest groups** have highlighted the need for Brief amendments to: improve provision for pedestrians and cyclists in the area; protect the Torvean landforms; avoid and reduce flood risk; protect the water environment; check the feasibility, impact and design of the canal waterspace development; reflect feasible bus routing arrangements; increase the proportion of greenspace within the Brief area; mitigate pollution, and; allocate land for the expansion of Kilvean Cemetery.
- 2.5. Some parties seek to re-open the debate on the alignment and design solution for West Link and the need to develop this part of the City at all. They list the adverse environmental and recreational effects of the Council's chosen route.
- 2.6. Several parties request the deletion of a direct vehicular route between the Mill Lade West Link Roundabout and Dores Road. The Rowing Club demand a significant enhancement of existing facilities that they use. Outstanding issues raised by Members are also listed.
- 2.7. A detailed housing site allocation issue has been raised by Inverness West Ward Members all of whom have requested the deletion from the Brief of an affordable housing site at Charleston View in the light of neighbour concerns. The recommendation is to remove this allocation.

3. Recommended Changes

- 3.1. **Appendix 1** includes the list of all amendments recommended to the Brief as a result of comments received. **Appendix 3** sets out the finalised Brief incorporating these amendments.
- 3.2. The key changes and reasons are as follows:
 - Additional pedestrian and cycle crossings of West Link and connections to it to improve safety and accessibility;
 - Reduction in riverside housing development area at Ness-side to reflect latest detailed flood risk assessment results and to provide a larger riverside amenity area;

- Other flood risk and surface water drainage requirements and safeguards to respond to concerns raised;
- Amendments to the canal waterspace development and other canalside facilities to reflect the latest position agreed with canal users and to allay legitimate concerns of Rowing Club;
- Deletion of a mixed use development area to the rear of the Premier Inn at Torvean and its use for an expanded Sports Hub facility incorporating a golf practice area and four, full standard size, generic sports pitches;
- Incorporation of the latest indicative layout and components of the Sports Hub and Golf Course Reconfiguration proposal(s) including a justification for the private land to be acquired (see separate item to this Committee);
- Land safeguarded for expansion of Kilvean Cemetery which is approaching its capacity;
- Amendment of the vehicular connection between Dores Road and the Mill Lade West Link Roundabout to make it indirect and its central section service vehicles only to reduce the risk of “rat-running” but retention of a more direct pedestrian / cycleway connection;
- Other “internal distributor” road amendments to address evidenced landowner / developer concerns regarding ransoms and viability;
- Revised bus routing to reflect the wishes of Stagecoach but retention of longer term park and ride opportunities;
- Revised phasing of development which takes a pragmatic approach to the early delivery of new homes and community facilities where it can be demonstrated that there is spare capacity in the required infrastructure;.
- Revised developer contributions text to offer clarification that the requirements are fair, equitable and proportionate.

3.3. The delivery of the West Link Road and the reconfiguration of the sporting uses at Torvean are central to delivery of this Brief. The Brief contains the principles of both schemes and indicative layouts. However it should be noted that the detail of these will be subject to future decisions of the Council.

4. Implications and Environmental Assessment

4.1. The Brief has been subject to a screening for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). It has been determined that an SEA will not be required as an SEA of the development potential of this area was undertaken at the time of the production of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and as part of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. The mitigation identified in the SEA has been carried forward into the Brief.

4.2. It has been necessary to consider the potential impact of the development may have on European Designated sites (Natura 2000). A Habitats Regulations Appraisal has been undertaken and necessary mitigation identified in this has been carried forward into the Brief.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1. The Brief content has evolved and been tested via a thorough and intensive consultation period including an initial design workshop Charrette, Committee consideration and a very well attended series of public exhibitions.
- 5.2. It will, subject to completion of final procedures, provide certainty to guide the successful and appropriate completion of this part of the City and facilitate the delivery of over 1400 new homes (including over 350 affordable homes), over 12ha of Open Space and a neighbourhood focused on active travel.

Recommendation

The Committee is invited to:-

- i. Note the responses to the consultation;
- ii. Agree **Appendix 3** as the content of the finalised Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief subject to the additional inclusion of any West Link Road scheme amendments agreed at Full Council on 5 September 2013
- iii. Agree that the finalised Brief be treated as a material planning consideration for development management purposes and completion of procedures towards its intended adoption as Statutory Supplementary guidance at PED Committee on 6th November 2013.

Signature:

Designation: Director of Planning & Development

Date: 02 July 2013

Authors: Malcolm Macleod (01463 702506)
Simon Hindson, Tim Stott, Douglas Chisholm (Development Plans Team)

Appendix 1: Summary of Comments Received on the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief (attached)

Appendix 2: Verbatim Comments Received on the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief: (available via:

<http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/developmentbriefsandframeworkplans/torveanandnesssidedevelopmentbrief.htm>)

Appendix 3: Finalised Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief

Background Papers: CIAC Report CIA-17-13

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT TORVEAN AND NESS-SIDE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF AND RECOMMENDED RESPONSES

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
J Laird	Believes Brief layout provides poor walking / cycling connections between new and existing housing at Ness-side, Holm and Lochardil and existing recreational facilities at Whin and Bught Parks. Desires better, safer connections. Suggests national Cycle Network (NCN) Route 78 would better be routed across the river bridge and through the Bught area and not circuitously around an electricity substation and along Dores Road.	No connections exist at present so a new bridge with wider than standard foot/cycleway on both sides is a net gain. In addition, further West Link scheme changes are proposed in terms of a low gradient connection between the road and the canal towpath, under and to the Holm Mills Roundabout and between Dores Road and the roundabout. The Brief also requires developer provision of other paths through the new Ness-side developments to increase permeability for walkers and cyclists. These will connect through to the shared footpath and cycleways which run alongside West Link. Lights controlled crossing points of West Link are being designed into West Link some of which will be a developer expense and requirement. See West Link item to this Committee for detail. Add additional connections to Brief and re-emphasise mapping of proposed developer funded crossings. NCN 78 runs along the south east side of Loch Ness and onward connections are largely on the east side of the River Ness. However, the more attractive nature of the route, crossing the new bridge, skirting Whin Park on the new cycleway and running up Bught Road on the west side of the Ness is recognised and is designed into the Brief and West Link scheme. Discussions are ongoing on the final route of NCN 78 and this is a scheme which is led by Transport Scotland. The Dores Road frontage route continues recent provision at Tesco and provides a segregated and therefore safer option than cycling on Dores Road. Accordingly, the Brief should continue to allow for both cycle routes.
M & J Baldwin	As residents of a Ness-side riverside house concerned that existing surface water drainage arrangements in the area should be improved, that a privacy set-back be allowed for in the development layout including screening, and that a developer requirement should be added to ensure existing properties are linked into mains sewerage when Ness-side is developed.	The developers of Ness-side will be required to produce a Drainage Impact Assessment that will assess existing and proposed surface water drainage arrangements across this area. Future arrangements will have to demonstrate no net detriment. West Link itself will be similarly "self-sufficient" in terms of drainage of road surface water. The developers and the Council are already talking to Scottish Water about optimum sewerage provision for the area. Ideally this would take in existing properties. However, the decision as to whether they are connected is a commercial decision for the householder (whether they are prepared to pay the sewerage component of the Council Tax), for Scottish Water (whether the subsidy available for connection is offset by this future income stream) and for the developer (whether the cost of sewer extension can be offset by the subsidy available). Privacy issues will be considered at the planning application stage when detailed layouts are known but it is normal planning practice to allow sufficient set-back to avoid issues of overlooking and loss of daylight. Moreover, the Brief promotes lower housing densities in this area. Ironically, the closer new properties are, then the cheaper and therefore more likely a public sewer connection will be. A more detailed flood risk assessment has been produced for this section of the River Ness and it reveals that a small part of the proposed housing area lies within the 1 in 200 year risk area and this land should therefore be excluded from the area proposed for built development. Reduce new housing extent at Ness-side which is subject to flood risk and re-designate that land as part of expanded riverside open space area.

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
J Smith	Supports the Brief content as thoughtful, attractive, balanced, combining well laid out residential areas with essential community provision, and clever connections for footpaths, cycle routes and road access. In particular, supports the opening up of parkland, recreational and walking opportunities along the banks of the River Ness and the connections with the canal towpaths plus the idea of a linear park, with footpaths alongside the River Ness in the Holm area. Believes the ponds have great potential for wildlife enhancement if the appropriate shrubs and trees are used.	Support welcomed. No Brief changes.
S Ross	Seeks a definitive statement in the Brief to protect the geologically important Torvean landforms and raises concerns over cumulative effect of increased recreation in the landforms.	The Brief and related Council proposals do promote an increase in recreational use of the former quarry. However, this increase in use will not result in any direct, physical impact on the esker landforms. Existing recreational use of the area is well established and the flat area of the quarry has been allocated for development for many years. Discussions have been held with Scottish Natural Heritage regarding the potential for adverse impact and this is being assessed and will be mitigated through the forthcoming West Link and Sports Hub etc. planning applications and their associated access management plans. It is accepted that the construction details and methods of any new recreational routes through the landforms must respect the physical integrity of the esker features. Include a requirement for an Access Recreational Management Plan for any new recreational access around Torvean Landforms SSSI.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	<p>Objects to Brief content unless changes are made as follows.</p> <p>1 No development to be shown within 1 in 200 year flood risk areas which would require a reduction in the housing area between West Link and the River Ness, the re-assessment of flood risk for elderly care accommodation at Milton of Ness-side and clarification that for the Holm Mills area that any redevelopment proposal should be to the same or a lower flood sensitivity land use. A fuller explanation of when developer funded flood risk assessments will be required in paragraph 6.6.</p> <p>2 A requirement in paragraph 6.6 that no development should take place on top of or within a 6m set-back of existing culverts and no development within 20m of the River Ness.</p> <p>3 A requirement in paragraph 6.6 that where a development impacts upon an existing groundwater abstraction or water supply then suitable mitigation will be required.</p>	<p>1 Most of SEPA's comments on flood risk are accepted and require amendments to the Brief. Update Constraints Map 3 to show most recent flood risk assessment results. See Ness-side housing area reduction detailed above. Add text to clarify that within the mixed use development site at Holm Mills area that any redevelopment proposal within the confirmed 1 in 200 year flood risk area should only be to the same or a lower flood sensitivity land use. The land at Milton of Ness-side has been subject to detailed developer flood risk assessment and the footprint of the building shows lies outwith the 1 in 200 year risk area. There will be an opportunity to re-visit this assessment during any future planning application process but there is no evidence of risk at present and therefore the Brief should not be changed in this regard. Add a fuller explanation of when developer funded flood risk assessments will be required in paragraph 6.6.</p> <p>2 The only significant mapped culverts within the Ness-side area do not follow naturalised, contour driven routes. They are surface water "sewer" pipes that divert around the sub-station and follow ownership boundaries. Accordingly, it would be unreasonable to insist that they be retained in their existing location or even open them up as more natural watercourses. However paragraph 6.6 should be amended to clarify that the drainage impact assessment for Ness-side should ensure no further culverting of existing watercourses and promote a series of surface water drainage devices that mirror natural processes and follow proposed contours as much as possible including a minimum 6m set back from the top of bank of these watercourses /</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		<p>bodies. See above regarding the addition of a 6m set-back reference. However, to impose a 20m set-back from the River Ness would be arbitrary when a detailed flood risk assessment justified contour is available and should establish the development set-back distance. Moreover the bridge works and existing development at Holm Mills are already within 20m. No further Brief change.</p> <p>3 All new development promoted at Ness-side is or will be serviced via public water mains. However, to allay SEPA's concerns an additional reference is appropriate. Add a requirement in paragraph 6.6 that where a development impacts upon an existing groundwater abstraction or water supply then suitable mitigation will be required.</p>
P A Martin	<p>Criticises successive councils for poor infrastructure decisions since the 1960s. Believes these decisions and resultant projects have been poor because of design, lack of local decision making, loss of greenspace and lack of detail and feasibility work. No better specific project suggested.</p>	<p>There has been considerable feasibility work and local consultation undertaken to this point to progress the West Link road scheme. The Sports Hub and Golf course Reconfiguration detailed feasibility work is ongoing. High quality design will be a key parameter for both projects. Combined the projects will deliver a net increase in the quality and quantity of useable and accessible greenspace in this part of the City. The canal waterspace development is at an early feasibility stage and dependent upon unprogrammed road improvements. No Brief change.</p>
Craig	<p>Believes that relocation of Caley Cruisers south west of the Tomnahurich Canal Bridge would remove the need for a second tandem bridge because it is the source of most canal bridge openings. Believes the new marina proposed in the Brief or one at Dochgarroch would be ideal albeit they can be unsightly and do not promote public access because of the need for crane lifting of craft, maintenance areas and security concerns.</p>	<p>The Council have discussed the Brief and related West Link road scheme with Caley Cruisers albeit more in terms of impact on navigation rather than potential relocation. Relocation would be a commercial decision for that company and a commercial negotiation between them and the landowner / operator of any new marina. The Brief should not prescribe the occupiers of any new marina. As stated by the respondent, relocation of existing canal users relocated from north of the pinch point may simply be replaced by new users wishing to make the same passage. Accordingly, the Council still believes a second tandem bridge is required. With good management, marinas can be attractive and welcoming places for canal users, residents and tourists. No Brief change.</p>
Scottish Canals	<p>Leisure craft pontoons should be located to the north of the new canal bridge. Traffic signs should read 'ROAD CLOSED' 'ROAD OPEN'</p>	<p>Additional berthing is being provided as part of the West Link road scheme. This and road traffic signage matters are dealt with in detail within the West Link item to this Committee. Amend Brief to reflect the latest berthing agreed as part of the West Link road scheme.</p>
G Tuley	<p>Several comments as follows.</p> <p>1 Suggests improvements to maps and text to improve their clarity.</p> <p>2 Queries how West Link (paragraph 4.5 reference) improves opportunities for walking and cycling to the City Centre.</p> <p>3 Believes its is premature to allocate land for housing at Ness-side without the West Link road scheme being confirmed by Scottish Ministers and avoiding future legal challenge.</p> <p>4 Concerned about adverse effect on existing sporting facilities</p> <p>5 Believes senior councillors have disqualified themselves from voting</p>	<p>1 Add improvements to maps to improve their legibility. Amend text to offer factual clarification.</p> <p>2 As recognised by the respondent above, the bridge plus the new Whin Park connection and existing Bught Road provides a more attractive, safer and flatter route to the City centre than the Dores Road radial with its physically constrained width and lack of full standard footway provision. No Brief change.</p> <p>3 The broad alignment and principle of a West Link road connection has been confirmed by three successive Scottish Executive Public Local Inquiry Reporters since the early 1980s. Significant housing land allocations were first made at Ness-side in the early 1990s. These allocations were tested at and passed two public inquiries and one recent Scottish Government appointed Reporter</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>on any West Link planning application because of their public support for it.</p> <p>6 Believes that noise and air pollution issues have been insufficiently addressed particularly in relation to impacts at the Canal Parks where rugby players and spectators should be insulated from the noise of the road.</p> <p>7 Believes any new sports pitches provided should be full sized.</p> <p>8 Concerned that core paths are retained not blocked by development. Wishes the riverside corridor remote path to be along the riverbank and other routes away from West Link.</p> <p>9 Opposes canal waterspace development because it will have a direct physical impact on the scheduled monument and is only a disguise for further housing development on Council owned land. Queries why the access to the marina is not shown on the West Link drawings.</p> <p>10 Queries why the West Link scheme does not show the three Brief pedestrian crossings and why the proposed cycle route does not run along the whole length of Dores Road.</p> <p>11 Queries need for roundabout to serve Milton of Ness-side land. Believes a traffic lights controlled crossroads would be safer for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>12 Foot / cycleways should be 3m not 2m wide.</p>	<p>chaired Examination. That said, the land has always been allocated subject to the Link being progressed. Indeed one function of the road is to allow completion of two City districts either side of the River and Canal. The possibility of later legal challenge can only be made on matters of procedure not on the planning merits of the scheme, which the Council believes have been made, tested and accepted at successive public local inquiries. No Brief change.</p> <p>4 The combined West Link and Sports Hub etc. projects will deliver a net improvement to the quality, quantity and accessibility of existing sports facilities. No Brief change.</p> <p>5 It is right and proper that councillors express support for the principle of what is already approved Council planning policy. They should not pre-judge the detail of the scheme until a full application is lodged and properly considered. No Brief change.</p> <p>6 Noise and air pollution issues associated with the West Link scheme are being assessed in detail as part of preparation of an Environmental Statement which will accompany the West Link road scheme planning application. This document will be in the public domain when the application is lodged. However, it has already been recognised that a noise issue will exist at the Canal Parks and mitigation has been proposed. Details of this mitigation are given within the West Link item to this Committee. No Brief change.</p> <p>7 It is accepted that any the new sports pitches provided should be the full standard size (including run-off / safety areas) appropriate to that sport. However, at present there is no certainty as to which sports clubs will be located where and therefore generic pitches should be indicated in the Brief. Delete mixed use development area to rear of Premier Inn and caravan park and replace with enlarged Sport Hub area (incorporating golf course practice area). This enlarged area has more than sufficient land to accommodate four, full standard, grass sports pitches.</p> <p>8 Access management documents will accompany future planning applications for the West Link and the Sports Hub etc. projects. These will deal with the detail of core path, Great Glen Way and other path creation, retention and where necessary diversion. There will be positive and negative effects. For example, the Great Glen Way will require diversion but will benefit from a safer lights controlled crossing of the A82. Diverted core paths at Ness-side will be more direct and pass between development. The Brief already shows a remote footpath passing between West Link and the River Ness which is broadly in line with existing informal provision. A top of river bank path would not be appropriate in terms of child safety, flood risk blockage and disturbance to anglers and the water environment. Quieter alternative routes will be available via a new connection between the river bridge and the canal towpath and the improved route along the north side of the Whin Park. See West Link item for detail of most proposed path changes.</p> <p>9 The canal waterspace development is at its initial feasibility stage but is already supported in principle through its allocation in the adopted Inverness Local Plan. However, it is recognised that any significant development here is dependent upon a presently unprogrammed fifth leg off the Torvean Roundabout and careful assessment of impact on the scheduled monument. This fifth leg has been designed and costed but is not necessary to achieve West Link's primary transport aims. No Brief change.</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		<p>10 West Link does not show the three pedestrian crossings indicated by the Brief because they are not necessary for the road scheme only for the development at Ness-side. They would therefore be a developer requirement and cost as and when applications are lodged for development at Ness-side. That said, the road is being designed in such a way that lights controlled crossings can be added at a later date in a cost efficient manner. In addition, a lay-by is being added to the West Link scheme design to allow walkers to park on the riverside of the road and not have to cross it. See West Link item for detail of this change and add lay-by to Brief mapping. The cycle route does not follow the length of Dores Road on the masterplan because it is outwith the Brief boundary. Constraints and background information mapping can flow outwith this Brief boundary but policy cannot. No Brief change.</p> <p>11 Existing and future traffic levels do not justify a lights controlled crossroads junction arrangement at Milton of Ness-side. A stepped T junction arrangement was considered but this resulted in greater mature broadleaf tree loss. A smaller roundabout is seen as the optimum solution in terms of minimising tree loss, slowing vehicle speeds and providing access proportionate to expected traffic flows. That said, a crossroads solution should have less land take and may be favoured by developers. This part of the Brief should be retained without change but future planning applications could consider alternative arrangements.</p> <p>12 The Council's standards prescribe an absolute minimum width of 2m for a shared foot / cycleway and a desirable minimum of 3m. Amend Brief accordingly.</p>
H Barron via agent	Objects as landowner at Charleston to Brief's proposed reduction in allocated housing land within his ownership. Concerned that replacement with golf course designation will significantly reduce the development potential of the land.	The proportion of Mr Barron's land earmarked for housing rather than golf course reconfiguration has been decreased for two principal reasons. These are to allow a better golf course (with less road severance and a shorter contiguous boundary with adjoining housing creating fewer compatibility / safety issues) and to reduce the need for a long, expensive and visually dominant distributor road linking Leachkin Road and General Booth Road through Mr Barron's land. Moreover, there are other allocated and/or permitted housing sites closeby at Westercraigs. The larger distributor road and larger housing allocation would also sever the Great Glen Way and impact on the quality and open aspect of views from the route. No Brief change.
Stagecoach	Considers that bus routes should pass as close as possible to houses served. Believes that a cross river route is not commercially viable at present and that the majority demand is for radial into and out of city centre routes. Bus stops preferable to bus laybys as they avoid buses having to pull out again. Stagecoach would be keen to support any park and ride scheme in the long term, however expresses doubt as to its viability as people driving into Inverness from the A82 would carry on rather than turning left to travel along General Booth Road and park then get a bus back along this road. Believes a layby/bus stop on General Booth Road closer to the Premier Inn would be more	The Council's Roads and Transport standards promote bus routes along local distributor roads that provide more direct access to housing areas and not along primary distributors such as West Link. These standards also recommend bus stops rather than bus laybys on local distributors. The Brief does not promote a cross River bus service but a circuitous suburban service may become commercially viable over time. The short term viability issues with park and ride are recognised however the Brief should plan for the longer term when the relative economics of different means of travel may have changed. Amend Brief to show bus stop provision on the realigned General Booth Road where requested by Stagecoach and to include text reference to potential longer term park and ride facilities at the Sports Hub and/or Canal waterspace development south of the A82. Suggested amendments to the Queens Park Roundabout are considered within the West

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	effective. Pulling into and out of a transport hub also increases journey time. Also suggests bus only leg into Aquadome/Inverness Leisure.	Link item to this Committee.
Cardrona Trust via agent GH Johnston	As owner of Milton of Ness-side land, supports provisions of Brief in terms of uses proposed. Welcome reduction in public access to riverside as this will affect fishing interests and the water environment. Outlines previous pre-application discussions and proposals and comments that the demand for uses may have changed. Urges Council to finalise Brief as soon as possible and start construction of West Link to provide certainty for private sector developers and investors. Requests that the Brief includes appropriate tree hold backs and protection areas for the woodland north of the Holm Burn.	The expressed support is noted. A tree setback has been included in the Indicative Masterplan for the Ness-side area and will this requirement will apply to all relevant applications in this area. An additional textual reference would be appropriate. Augment existing tree set-back reference in paragraph 6.6 of Brief.
Burt Boulton Holdings via agents	<p>Offers several comments as landowner at Ness-side.</p> <p>1 Wishes to maximise its development value by securing residential allocation to be developed by others.</p> <p>2 Believes that the Brief should be amended in line with its suggestions then be re-issued for further consultation and be tested to ensure it provides for development viability then there should be an independent hearing of any objections to the Brief.</p> <p>3 Its land should be given a positive, higher value residential allocation because of the previous local plan allocation, previous permission, the delay in activating the land, the lack of viability and deliverability of the land given current low land values.</p> <p>4 Objects to an unfair proportion of water and waste water drainage infrastructure being identified on its land and public open space. Believes these developable land takes and costs should be shared across all the Ness-side landowners and by others where others benefit from provision (for example with West Link which provides a wider public benefit).</p> <p>5 Similarly objects to developer requirement for footpath, cycleway and road infrastructure to a higher standard than exists on adjoining land and elsewhere in the City.</p> <p>6 Believes Designing Streets principles need to be adapted to local and market circumstances not slavishly adhered to.</p> <p>7 Believes the Council should produce a financial feasibility assessment for each landowner so that each can be sure of the</p>	<p>1 The wishes of the investor to make a profit are noted.</p> <p>2 The Brief does not contain any planning principles not already established within the approved development plan, which has been subject to independent examination. For example its developer contributions approach is already endorsed within the development plan. To become statutory guidance, the Brief will require to be cleared by Scottish Ministers and this will provide an extra, independent check on its validity. Current planning legislation does not allow for an independent hearing of objections to development briefs because they deal with localised issues and need to be founded upon a development plan policy. No Brief change.</p> <p>3 The Brief supports residential development on most of the owner's land because of the previous planning history and the land's suitability for completion of the Ness urban district. However, this support in principle does not oblige the Council to guarantee a particular return for an investor. The current state of the property market is largely outwith the control of the Council and the presently low land values do not oblige the Council to reduce, defer or waive its infrastructure standards and related developer requirements / payments. The Developer Contributions: Supplementary Guidance sets out the procedure that can be followed if a developer considers that their site is not viable following application of developer contributions. There are other effective housing sites within the City of Inverness which are already serviced and can deliver growth in the current market. No Brief change.</p> <p>4 The Council has provided a degree of equalisation of development costs and values across the Ness-side area by allowing all landowners the same ratio of housing units to developable land area. Non-developable land does not include land required for drainage infrastructure nor sports pitches because the locations of these facilities have a degree of flexibility. Included are "fixed" constraint areas such as set-back areas from existing woodland, flood risk sources, high voltage overhead lines, and West Link. The Council believes that this approach is equitable. The precise location and design of drainage infrastructure and public open space provision will be considered through the future planning application processes but it is likely all landowner / developers will need to release land for</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>balance of costs to value. High housing densities are not always a guarantee of high development values. This assessment should take account of the loss of developable land to drainage infrastructure and other non housing uses. The Council should co-ordinate all landowners and developers in implementing the development of the area.</p> <p>8 Believes the indicative masterplans are overly prescriptive and the text should clarify they are only indicative.</p> <p>9 Accepts principle and broad location of West Link and Mill Lade Roundabout but objects to excessive developable land take from internal roads. Believes that the Mill Lade Roundabout to Dores Road connection is unnecessary and may create rat-running problems and so too the rear of Tesco and sub-station road. Believes an additional access off West Link could remove the need for two internal distributors and that buses would use West Link and Dores Road.</p> <p>10 Suggests that if a Mill Lade Roundabout to Dores Road bus only link is required then this should be part of the West Link scheme and on the common boundary with the adjoining owners. Wishes to avoid being ransomed by any requirement for this link to be anywhere other than on the common boundary.</p> <p>11 Disagrees with the principle of any development set-back from West Link.</p> <p>12 The Council should establish a financial protocol for equitable developer contributions and fall back mechanisms in the event of non availability of top-up public funding or developer failure.</p> <p>13 The table on contributions should be titled as landowner contributions not developer contributions as this is more accurate as to who pays. The opportunity cost of affordable housing provision should be included and a mechanism included to allow alternative or no provision if public subsidy is not available at the right time.</p> <p>14 Believes public transport subsidies are unreasonable and should be provided by the public purse.</p> <p>15 Believes drainage costs should be included in the contributions section to get a sensible overall assessment of viability.</p> <p>16 Believes phasing of contributions should be flexible to allow for market fluctuations and prevent the non release of allocated land.</p> <p>17 Believes land should not be gifted for essential infrastructure but bought using conventional valuation principles. Similarly, believes all parties including the Council should bear their own consents, orders</p>	<p>these facilities. In advance landowners / developers should work together in commissioning drainage reports to better assess optimum arrangements and more detailed costings. For example, a stepped series of surface water drainage (SuDS) devices through the Ness-side area may well be more effective than a single large pond on Burt Boulton's ownership. However, Burt Boulton do own the lowest point of the Ness-side development area which is the most technically feasible location for the final SuDS device and an outlet to the River Ness and for any sewage pumping station (because it avoids the need for further expensive pumping of waste water). It is accepted that landowner / developers are only asked to pay in a proportionate manner for new deficiencies created by or existing deficiencies worsened by their development. If a facility such as West Link fulfils a wider public benefit then the payment sought will only relate to the impact of that particular development. No Brief change.</p> <p>5 The Council has published standards for transport requirements within new developments. Adjoining City areas may have lower specification footpaths, cycleways and roads but these developments are very dated and circumstances have changed in terms of national policy, the desire to encourage modal shift away from private cars, and in terms of public safety. No Brief change.</p> <p>6 It is accepted that Designing Streets principles are just that and are not intended for slavish adherence. However, the Ness-side area is reasonably unique in Highland in terms of being relatively flat, well drained, urban, large and without an overly attractive outlook. These factors mean it is particularly suitable for pedestrian priority "home zone" style layouts. The development value can be created by the quality of these layouts in terms of the materials used, their safety, their accessibility and their architectural quality. No Brief change.</p> <p>7 It is not the Council's responsibility to assess and then guarantee each landowner a return on their investment. As stated above, there are other effective housing sites within the City in the short term. The Council's general approach to contributions allows for developers to demonstrate abnormal costs at planning application stage and seek a reduction in payments. This option would be open to Burt Boulton. However, land for drainage infrastructure and public open space would not be regarded as abnormal costs. Any expensive remediation of the brownfield element of the site may be. The Council has already and will continue to prompt landowners to co-operate with each other but cannot coerce joint working. No Brief change.</p> <p>8 The masterplans is clearly labelled as indicative but an additional textual reference would be appropriate. Add Brief text to clarify that masterplans are indicative and will be subject to detailed design discussions and amendment through the processing of planning applications.</p> <p>9 Several parties have queried the nature, impact and necessity of the road link between the Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road. The Council has always recognised the potential for "rat-running" if such a road link is provided but wishes to create cost-efficient routing for service vehicles including refuse, winter maintenance and bus vehicles. In light of the comments received, the Ness-side Indicative Masterplan has been amended so that future developers will be required to provide a secondary distributor connection between the Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road but via an indirect connection that will prevent through use by private cars. The middle section of this secondary</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	and legal costs.	<p>distributor will be for service vehicles only. This restriction will be implemented via a future traffic order or other such similar measure. Amend Brief accordingly.</p> <p>10 The spur off the Mill Lade Roundabout is on the common boundary and includes ransom free T junctions. The foot/cycle link described above will be on the common boundary where feasible. No further Brief change.</p> <p>11 The 25 metre development set back is a standard that has been applied and accepted along the rest of the main distributor road. It is required to safeguard future householder amenity in terms of noise, light and air pollution generated by the road. There may be some flexibility where non housing uses are proposed but Burt Boulton are only proposing residential use. No Brief change.</p> <p>12 Precise funding mechanisms will be defined within the legal agreements that will accompany future planning applications. It is normal practice that these include provisions for developer clawback. No Brief change.</p> <p>13 Amend Table 4 Heading to “Landowner / Developer Contributions”. The Council has produced and adopted, detailed supplementary guidance on the issue of affordable housing provision which sets out alternative forms of provision should public subsidy not be available. However the site is so large and strategically significant that on site provision will be expected and subsidy for direct provision likely to be available.</p> <p>14 Public transport subsidies are only sought as a temporary measure at the start of a new development when a commercial service is not viable and to encourage the habit of new householders using public transport. Long term subsidies, for example in remote rural areas are a matter for the Council not developers. No Brief change.</p> <p>15 Water and sewerage costs are outwith the control of the Council both in terms of its expenditure and its ability to assess what requirements are needed. Despite this, the Council continues to lobby and assist Scottish Water to determine the optimum arrangements and the cost of such provision for this part of Inverness. A re-visit of a previous developer funded Development Impact Assessment has been scoped and Burt Boulton should engage with other landowners in progressing that work. Should the results of the work demonstrate abnormal costs then these will be taken into account when planning applications are lodged. No Brief change.</p> <p>16 As stated above, there is no short term deficiency in terms of allocated and serviced housing land within the City. In such circumstances there is no over-riding imperative to reduce, defer or waive its infrastructure standards and related developer requirements / payments for this area. However, the need for developer contributions can be subject to pause and review points and there is a clear process set out in the Developer Contributions: Supplementary Guidance which may be used if the Developer believes their site is no longer viable due to the application of developer contributions. These review points have already been written into the Brief. No Brief change.</p> <p>17 It is accepted that the acquisition of land for essential public infrastructure including West Link should follow established valuation principles. Amend paragraph 6.6 of Brief to reflect this.</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<p>Carolyn Thain</p>	<p>Concerns over privacy (overlooking) and flood risk at existing Millerton Avenue property if new development on NHS Highland owned land proceeds. Already experienced flooding problems post Robertson's development at Westercraigs.</p>	<p>The housing extents shown in the Brief are indicative but include garden ground so any houses will be more distant from Millerton Avenue reducing the potential for overlooking. There is also an intervening public footpath. All direct neighbours will be notified of any future application and will be able to see and comment on the detail at that time. Flooding issues caused or worsened by the development at Westercraigs have been investigated by the Council and Robertson's surface water drainage device between its site and Kinmylies now appears to be functioning in a more efficient manner. Any new development in this area would also have to assess potential flood risk and ensure no net detriment to adjoining properties post development. No Brief change.</p>
<p>Robertson Homes Ltd (RHL)</p>	<p>Concerns regarding Brief's impact upon RHL landholding at Charleston as follows.</p> <p>1 Believes that all its landholding within the Brief area should be allocated for housing as this reflects previous outline planning consent.</p> <p>2 Calculates that only a local distributor specification road can be constructed between Leachkin Road and General Booth Road on the alignment suggested in the Brief. Anything of a higher standard would be compromised by the greenspace gap and be out of character with the standard of Golf View Road at the suggested point of connection. Wishes a guarantee that no ransom will exist in achieving this connection and that the Council will fund any associated improvements outwith RHL's site.</p> <p>3 Objects to reduction in previously allocated expansion land at Charleston owned by Mr Barron because this would larger area would part finance a higher capacity distributor road connection which would benefit the RHL land.</p> <p>4 Objects to Map 5 Masterplan because: RHL was not fully involved in its preparation; the layout may affect deliverability; the greenspace east of the SNH car park should be part of the reconfigured golf course as useable public open space; the housing capacity figures are too prescriptive and should allow upward flexibility once detailed feasibility work has been undertaken; RHL have not endorsed the numbers as stated in paragraph 5.19;</p> <p>5 Disagrees with Developer Contributions section because: contributions should also be sought from non housing developers; land required by the Council should be acquired using accepted valuation methods not at nil value, and; imposing too high a contribution level will inhibit development of allocated land and hold</p>	<p>1 The Brief allows for an all housing development of this land should market and other circumstances dictate that this is the most viable use of the land. However, RHL are looking to diversify uses at Westercraigs to respond to the current housing market downturn and there may be other viable uses such as district scale retail facilities and residential institutions such as care homes. It would curtail the options of RHL and the Council to insist on housing only. No Brief change.</p> <p>2 The Brief only envisages a lower standard 6m carriageway local distributor road connection. The pinchpoint and connecting Golf View Road is adequate for this purpose albeit localised junction improvements will be required. A no ransom guarantee for Council owned land would be appropriate but the costs of the connection should be borne by the developer who benefits from the increased development capacity that the connection yields. Amend Brief to clarify that the Golf View Road gap land will be gifted (ransom free) to any developer funding and completing the construction of a local distributor road connection between Leachkin Road and Golf View Road.</p> <p>3 The reduction in the previously allocated for housing land south of Mile End is to remove the need for a larger distributor road with its greater cost and impact and to allow reconfiguration to a better quality golf course. No Brief change.</p> <p>4 RHL attended the design workshop Charrette and two meetings have taken place with RHL as part of preparation of the Brief. Telephone contact has also taken place with the landowner NHS Highland. The layout and Brief is flexible in terms of land use, housing numbers and layout. Indeed the housing totals exceed the 290 figure on the latest Westercraigs RHL Development Schedule. The suggestion that RHL's greenspace land should be specifically identified for golf course extension is not accepted. The land may be useful for this purpose should more suitable land areas not be available but it has unhelpful contours, crosses the Great Glen Way and is already consented for local community sports pitch and greenspace provision. Accordingly, a generalised greenspace notation would still be appropriate. No Brief change.</p> <p>5 Developer Contributions will be sought in line with the provisions of the Council's adopted Developer Contributions: Supplementary Guidance. This includes a formula for seeking contributions from non-residential development. Amend Brief to include reference to non-housing developer contributions. Where the Council is acquiring land this should be done using conventional valuation techniques. Amend Brief to reflect this change. As set out in the Developer Contributions: Supplementary Guidance it is for the developer to demonstrate to the Council that their development</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>back economic growth.</p> <p>6 Objects to proposed phasing in Brief because believes that Barron and NHS Highland / RHL land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>would not be viable if subject to a particular level of developer contributions.</p> <p>6 The earlier phasing of the land owned by Mr Barron was a cartographic error in the draft Brief and should be the same (final) phase as the NHS Highland / RHL land. Correct Brief accordingly.</p>
<p>Scottish Natural Heritage</p>	<p>Requests greater natural heritage safeguards and developer requirements as follows.</p> <p>1 A developer requirement for a strategic drainage impact assessment to assess all the Ness-side area developments for their impact on River Ness water quality because of its connectivity with the River Moriston and Moray Firth Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). This to include a requirement for all development to connect to public water and waste water mains.</p> <p>2 Safeguarding of green networks and greenspaces within and connecting to the site including a linear riverside greenspace.</p> <p>3 A developer requirement to avoid any adverse effects on the adjacent Torvean Landforms Site of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>4 A developer requirement to protect the water quality of the River Ness during construction works (particularly at Ness-side) by the production and approval of a Construction Method Statement to avoid pollution and sediment run-off.</p> <p>5 A developer requirement to assess the impact of any increase in boat traffic attributable to the new Torvean marina on sensitive areas of the Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p>	<p>These safeguards and developer requirements are appropriate and should be added within paragraph 6.6 of the Brief and have also been identified through the Habitats Regulations Appraisal of the Plan.</p>
<p>D Shields</p>	<p>1 Suggests that the open, green character of the Ness-side area should be retained to a degree by including a public park similar to Bellfield Park on the Dores Road frontage. Concerned that all formal recreational facilities are being provided north west of the river and only one sports pitch to the south.</p> <p>2 Desires other uses not just housing at Ness-side and suggests cafes and other leisure areas, especially away from the Tesco area.</p> <p>3 Believes the riverside green corridor area should be lowered to act as a flood storage device to protect the city centre</p> <p>4 Existing tree belts should be retained, managed and augmented as appropriate.</p>	<p>1 There will be other localised play facilities sought from developers within the Ness-side area in addition to the single sports pitch indicated on the masterplan. The sports pitch area could be used for other recreational uses if local demand and funding availability points in this direction. However, strategic City wide facilities already exist at the Bught / Torvean and adding to this hub is more cost efficient in terms of shared changing facilities, access, parking etc. No Brief change.</p> <p>2 The Brief already allows for a large area for mixed use adjacent to the Holm Mills. Dependent upon the current landowners' willingness to release this land for alternative development – the Holm Mills owner wishes to expand commercial activities at the Mills to include cafes, restaurants and further tourist retail facilities. The Brief supports such expansion but this is dependent upon a change in current landowner intentions. No Brief change.</p> <p>3 The West Link road scheme does include some additional flood storage on the Canal Parks side of the river but lowering on the Ness-side side would make this green corridor less useable. The first phase of a flood protection scheme for the city centre is already proceeding. No Brief change.</p> <p>4 The Brief allows for the retention and augmentation of the principal tree belts. No Brief change.</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
J Risby	<p>1 What will happen to golf course?</p> <p>2 How will noise and pollution affect Whin Park?</p> <p>3 Believes the Ness-side development is too dense and should have greater greenspace via allotments and/or larger gardens.</p>	<p>1 The golf course will be reconfigured to provide a course and facilities of better overall quality than existing.</p> <p>2 The West Link Road scheme Environmental Statement is in preparation and will accompany the submission of the road planning application. It will assess and propose mitigation for noise and other pollution effects.</p> <p>3 Through implementation of the Council's Open Space in New Residential Developments: Supplementary Guidance developers will be required to make provision for allotments either on site or make an off-site contribution towards their delivery. Lower density development is promoted within the Brief closer to the River Ness.</p> <p>No Brief changes.</p>
R Newmark & A Whitford	<p>Quote the Highland Structure Plan 2001 as establishing the direction for Inverness' future expansion as eastward within the A96 Corridor not to the south west along the A82 because of the environmental and traffic network constraints here.</p>	<p>The Highland Structure Plan 2001 was superseded in 2012. The extant development plan for the area supports the consolidation of the City of Inverness and phased expansion of the A96 Corridor. The misunderstood reference was a rejection (which is still a sound judgement) of major expansion of the City on its south west flank <u>beyond</u> land which has been earmarked for development since the early 1990s – i.e. it makes no sense to expand the City towards Dochgarroch given the canal bridge pinchpoint, the limited spare capacity of the A82 and the Torvean landforms Site of Special Scientific Interest but land at Ness-side and Charleston completes existing City districts and neighbourhoods in close proximity to existing and proposed facilities. No Brief change.</p>
A Matheson	<p>Requests that the Brief incorporate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a footpath connection along the whole length of the River Ness for access by walkers and anglers, and; • a cycleway remote from the Dores Road frontage. 	<p>The Brief incorporates footpath provision where feasible. Crossing private property or where safety is an issue, for example at Milton of Ness-side or across the Holm Burn, where there is no established access is problematic. The Brief suggests, as an alternative, walking circuits with more formalised riverside access. A cycleway remote from the Dores Road frontage is already included within the Brief. No Brief change.</p>
Simon Varwell	<p>Supports concept of more sports facilities in a relatively central location and opening up more land at Ness-side for housing and other facilities. However, disagrees with West Link routing because it is environmentally destructive and unpopular. Believes a high level bridge on piers not an embankment or a tunnel through Ness-side would still allow development there and be economic.</p>	<p>The support in principle is noted. A tunnel cutting would have a significant developable land take at Ness-side and a high level bridge would not provide local road access connections to open up development land. Arguably, such a bridge would also blight the marketability of land close to such a structure. No Brief change.</p>
James Kidd	<p>Believes the surface water drainage pond between the tandem bridges and the canal waterspace further south are not feasible and are designed to mislead the public that amenity areas will be created</p>	<p>The idea of an extended waterspace was suggested by canal users at the design workshop Charrette and accepted by the majority of those attending and was not suggested by the Council. It does have challenges in terms of feasibility notably because of the need for an unprogrammed fifth leg of the</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	and should be removed from the Brief and West Link scheme.	Torvean Roundabout and a direct physical impact on the scheduled monument canal. However, the principle of such provision has broad support and it is worthy of further consideration. If the canal waterspace development doesn't happen the land will remain as green or recreational space. The pond indicated on the West Link road scheme drawings between the bridges is to accommodate surface water drainage from the adjoining road surfaces. No Brief change.
Rob Raynor	Welcomes greenspace provision within Brief but wishes riverside path to follow the whole length of the Ness although not be lit because this will affect otters and badgers. A badger survey and any necessary mitigation should be undertaken.	The Brief incorporates footpath provision where feasible. Crossing private property or where safety is an issue, for example at Milton of Ness-side or across the Holm Burn, where there is no established access is problematic. The Brief suggests, as an alternative, walking circuits with more formalised riverside access. It is not intended to light any of the remote paths partly for the reasons stated. All applications within the Brief area will need to consider badger issues including survey and mitigation where necessary. The Council has produced non statutory planning guidance on this issue. No Brief change.
Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group via agent	<p>1 Supports Brief content in terms of allocation of existing Holm Mills as a commercial site / tourism destination with potential for expansion.</p> <p>2 Requests that the Mills complex is identified as an important existing facility on Map 2: Facilities and Movement Audit because of its importance to local and tourist trade.</p> <p>3 Concerned that the Ness-side masterplan shows no direct, ransom free vehicular access from the proposed new Link Road to the existing Holm Mills site and believes this could prejudice future expansion of the facility.</p>	<p>1 Support noted.</p> <p>2 This is an oversight and should be corrected. Add existing Holm Mills complex to Map 2: Facilities and Movement Audit.</p> <p>3 The West Link Road scheme does not and will not include a road connection all the way through to the existing Holm Mills ownership boundary. This is not essential in transport terms for the existing operation at the Mills complex and is likely to involve compulsory acquisition of intervening land. If the intervening land becomes available for expansion of the existing commercial / tourism complex then the Brief masterplan allows for this connection to the Link Road to be made. Extending the car priority road notation to the existing Mills ownership boundary may allay the Group's concerns to an extent but construction of this link will be a matter for commercial negotiation between private parties and a private cost. Amend Map 9 of Brief accordingly.</p>
M De La Torre	<p>1 Believes traffic should use the West Link not the Mill Lade Roundabout to Dores road connection. Concerned about capacity of Dores Road and Island Bank Road particularly its lack of full standard pavement provision..</p> <p>2 Believes the lack of recreational facilities planned on the south east side of the river will increase traffic flow across the river and the level of congestion will increase again.</p> <p>3 Believes the Brief should promote more strategic non-car routes between Inverness and Dores for the benefit of locals and tourists rather than concentrate on roads and development.</p>	<p>1 See recommended response 9 to Burt Boulton above. The vehicular connection should not be made but a pedestrian / cyclist link should be retained. The West Link will allow allocated City expansion without increasing congestion on the Dores Road / Island Bank Road radial.</p> <p>2 The new river bridge will be a high capacity road designed to take cross river trips and take them out off the radials and out of the City centre. It will make strategic recreational facilities more accessible to residents on both sides of the river / canal than they are at present. For example, Kinmylies residents won't have to queue at a canal bridge to reach the Bught facilities and Holm residents will be able to drive, walk and cycle to Whin Park far more quickly. That said, the Brief does make provision for a sports pitch, a riverside linear park, play areas and other public open spaces south east of the River Ness.</p> <p>3 The Brief will be part of the Council's development plan. Other documents and agencies deal with longer distance recreational access routes. The Brief concentrates on land use and access within its boundary but does promote connections to known or likely routes such as the east Loch Ness national cycle route and the foot / cycle way required along the frontage of Ness Castle as part of the</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		<p>planning permission there. No further Brief changes.</p>
<p>Tulloch Homes Ltd (THL)</p>	<p>THL comments as landowner at Ness-side. Suggests alternative masterplan for Ness-side which better meets its interests. Seeks the following Brief changes.</p> <p>1 Suggests only one internal distributor road is required because they have a greater land take and cost, don't comply with the spirit of the Government's Designing Streets agenda, and would undermine the viability of development. Therefore suggests that as well as the potential access to THL land from the Tesco mini roundabout spur an additional non distributor road link option should be incorporated, east/ west between the two main development areas. The Tesco internal distributor should be dropped because it interferes with access to the service yard and the sub-station opposite.</p> <p>2 Believes that the south west to north west central green corridor should be reduced and breached by a road link to THL land close to Tesco because the green corridor was shown under the overhead lines at the previous Charrette, it will divide residential communities and create safety and anti-social issues, particularly if it contains significant tree planting/ landscaping, and the alternative access road may be ransomed. Green lane linked pockets of open space would be more appropriate and would serve as more distinct focal points.</p> <p>3 Concerned that THL should not be prevented from developing their landholding if strategic drainage infrastructure shown on other owner's land is not available or developed timeously. Interim infrastructure solutions should be supported within the Brief.</p> <p>4 Welcomes density levels suggested in Brief as appropriate to a flat urban site close to facilities but wishes the upper end of the range to be flexible provided the layout proposed is appropriate. Believe their test layout adheres to Designing Streets principles, contains meaningful areas of open space and can deliver a viable development of 400-450 housing units. A lower number would only encourage suburban designs and layouts.</p> <p>5 Suggests that the West Link Ness-side Roundabout to existing Ness-side houses access arrangements should be revised to give priority to the larger site in recognition of the likely traffic flow and avoid a further roundabout, which would disorientate road users.</p>	<p>1 Map 9 is indicative to the extent that detailed road layout can vary from that shown. Extension of the Tesco service yard access road as an internal link road at a local distributor road standard is not essential particularly if there are significant ransom or other costs in delivering local sub-station relocation and service yard entrance reconfiguration. However, the road exists and is underutilised. An alternative south west to north east connection may be acceptable at a non distributor road standard because this connection is not intended as a bus route only as a car priority road. No Brief change.</p> <p>2 The central green corridor exists to provide amenity value to neighbouring and other residents, to provide safe passage for people and wildlife, to protect and augment existing woodland and to provide a visual break and vista between urban development. It should not therefore be reduced or severed. It averages around 50m in width, will be overlooked and additional woodland will be limited to specimen trees not a swathe of barrier planting and it will not therefore be a haven for anti social behaviour. Detailed design of this area will be considered at planning application stage but it may have more serpentine margins as long as its function as a visually connected, green network / corridor is maintained and its connections to adjoining housing areas are frequent and effective. There is insufficient evidence of any third party ransom existing at the Tesco mini roundabout and therefore there is no justification for the new road link suggested which in itself will create a ransom. No Brief change.</p> <p>3 The Council continues to prompt landowners to work together to resolve common infrastructure issues, in particular surface and foul water drainage arrangements. The masterplan indicates the optimum location of such facilities. However, it would be reasonable that the Brief allows for interim infrastructure arrangements if any developer can provide evidence of unreasonable non co-operation by another landowner(s) and these arrangements are acceptable to the relevant agencies such as SEPA, Scottish Water and the Council's Flood Team. Add such a statement to Developer Requirements section of Brief.</p> <p>4 The Brief housing numbers are already expressed as a range the upper end of which allows for 389 units on the THL ownership which equates to an average density higher than many other parts of the City. It is accepted that absolute figures are not appropriate and there will be some flexibility if a particularly high standard of layout and architectural design quality is proposed. No Brief change.</p> <p>5 The proposed amended access arrangements would create a ransom and are not essential in transport terms. No Brief change.</p> <p>6 The development blocks shown on Map 9 fronting West Link are indicative. Short two or three storey terraces of town houses may be the most appropriate form of development but this will be a matter for future planning applications and market circumstances. The Brief's requirement is for a form, mass and layout of development that creates the visual impression (if not the physical reality) of continuous, albeit set-back, frontage to this part of West Link with parking and access to the rear not a</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>6 Believes higher density, larger mass buildings should be provided via a mix of flats and townhouses not via a continuous terrace because this would allow a more sensitive layout and more accessible car parking.</p> <p>7 Urges that THL's landholding includes an element of Phase 1 development because they are the only builder owner at Ness-side and West Link will be phased from this Dores Road end. Believe that Phase 1 houses should be occupied before the connection with the A82 is made as long as it doesn't prejudice delivery of the road and this approach is justified by a Transport Assessment. Desires early opening and access to the first phase of West Link because otherwise THL will be blighted by construction but not able to benefit from it. The Brief should also clarify that not all areas of a previous phase have to be complete before development of the next phase can begin.</p> <p>8 Believes developer contributions are broadly acceptable. Comments that THL has a proven good track record as an affordable housing provider and will provide an element of such housing within its first phase. However wishes greater flexibility on other contributions which should be subject to negotiation until the true costs of developing the site are known. Want West Link and other costs to be better defined so that more certainty can be provided on the level of future contributions. Believes that West Link and other contributions should only cover the additional deficiency created by new development and not resolve existing problems plus should comply with Government advice on this issue. Believes education contributions should be clarified in particular the timing of a primary school at Ness Castle. Queries the acceptability and deliverability of the Council requiring gifting of land for essential infrastructure.</p> <p>9 Comments that the water main shown on Map 3 crossing the site in a west/east direction is a 50mm asbestos pipe and as such does not represent a constraint to development. Queries what land uses are permissible within the 25m set-back to West Link carriageway zone.</p>	<p>series of back garden fences. No Brief change.</p> <p>7 It is acknowledged that there is an error within the draft Brief's Map 10 Phasing. That part of THL's ownership between the central green corridor and Tesco should be Phase 1 not Phase 3. Any development proposal at Ness-side which envisages occupation of development prior to completion of the A82 connection of West Link will need to be justified by transport assessment. The Council's TEC Services have rejected the concept of phased opening of West Link within Ness-side as an unnecessary project cost. The Tesco mini roundabout provides adequate access. An amendment to clarify that not all areas of a previous phase have to be complete before development of the next phase can begin would be appropriate as the timing of land release is uncertain. Amend Brief accordingly.</p> <p>8 Developer contributions will be sought in line with Policy 32 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Developer Contributions: Supplementary Guidance which is based on and consistent with the tests set out in Circular 3/2012. The Council allows flexibility in its approach to developer contributions where it is required through using mechanisms such as pause and review, phasing of contributions and allowing developers to evidence the impact of abnormal costs on viability. This flexibility will address the highlighted uncertainty on education provision with this site. More detailed West Link costs and additional traffic generation figures are being prepared at present and this information, when available, will be in the public domain. Essential infrastructure will be acquired using conventional valuation techniques. No further Brief change.</p> <p>9 Map 3 maps existing water mains as utilities not constraints but the information supplied is noted. The 25m set-back from West Link is measured from carriageway edge so the use of the land will include the foot / cycleway, verge, drainage ditch, fence and then the balance as greenspace amenity buffer. It should not contain houses or even private garden ground. Its purpose is to safeguard future householders from air, noise and light pollution which hopefully is an aim that would be shared by a quality house-builder. Exceptions would apply if non housing uses were promoted in close proximity to West Link and a lesser set-back is indicated between the Dores Road and Ness-side Roundabouts where denser development is promoted and an impression of frontage to West Link is required. No Brief change.</p>
<p>Highland Council TEC Services</p>	<p>Reports that Kilvean Cemetery has a future capacity for approximately 15 years of lair sales and that therefore in the next 5 years it will be necessary to identify additional capacity either as an extension to Kilvean or at a new location. Comments that extension to the south is limited by the access road to the cemetery from the A82 and to the west the land is overly steep and would require substantial</p>	<p>The Brief should allow for expansion of Kilvean Cemetery as an essential community use as far as this is compatible with a suitable reconfiguration of Torvean Golf Course. Add cemetery extension land suggested to Brief text and mapping.</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	earthworks for laying out burial lairs. Brief Layout 2 provides some opportunity for extension on the north side, however the ground becomes overly steep to the north limiting how much area could be incorporated into cemetery. Access to the extension from the cemetery would require a strip of land to be reserved to avoid crossing the gardens of remembrance. This area is crossed by a low voltage power line which will also limit capacity. This extension may provide an additional 10 years of capacity.	
R Ardern	Believes that Option 7 should be pursued in preference to the Council's chosen alignment and design solution and therefore requests that the Brief should designate the Ness-side land take for Option 7 as an amenity buffer area prior to future construction. Believes a bridge and its embankment would be attractive and that any adverse impact on neighbours' amenity would be known about prior to purchase and therefore acceptable.	Option 7 would not allow direct, local development access and would prevent the development of some allocated land. It is the Council's view that it would also have a significant adverse impact on local amenity and blight adjoining, allocated land. No Brief change.
D Henderson	Offers general support. Believes Ness-side linear riverside park should be expanded and have better access and amenities. The Sports Hub proposals require much more focused attention and closer consultation with the sports clubs.	A more detailed flood risk assessment has been produced for this section of the River Ness and it reveals that a small part of the proposed housing area lies within the 1 in 200 year risk area and this land should therefore be excluded from the area proposed for built development. Reduce new housing extent at Ness-side which is subject to flood risk and re-designate that land as part of expanded riverside open space area. In addition, a lay-by is being added to the West Link scheme design to allow walkers to park on the riverside of the road and not have to cross it. See West Link item for detail of this change and add lay-by to Brief mapping. It is not appropriate to provide children's play equipment or other such formal amenities close to deep, fast running water and relatively distant from the households served. The evolution of the Sports Hub proposals has included and continues to include a series of meetings with the sports clubs affected.
M Allan	Feels the proposed density of housing at Ness-side will inevitably cause a great increase in traffic along the Dores Road radial.	See various recommended responses and reasons above. West Link and the removal of a direct vehicular connection between Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road will allow the development of allocated land at Ness-side without an increase in congestion along this radial. No further Brief change.
JD Robb	Expresses concerns over West Link and Map 9 roads layout encouraging increased "rat-running" along Island Bank Road which has no spare capacity and cannot practicably be improved. Believes there should be no vehicular connection between the Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road or at least that any emergency access be via controlled barrier. Buses should be re-routed. Also believes	Several parties have queried the nature, impact and necessity of the road link between the Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road. The Council has always recognised the potential for "rat-running" if such a road link is provided but wishes to create cost-efficient routing for service vehicles including refuse, winter maintenance and bus vehicles. In light of the comments received, the Ness-side Indicative Masterplan has been amended so that future developers will be required to provide a secondary distributor connection between the Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road but via an

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>that the triangular shaped area of residential zoning proposed next to the Ness-side buildings should be re-designated for public open space given the deficiency of such space on this side of the River Ness.</p>	<p>indirect connection that will prevent through use by private cars. The middle section of this secondary distributor will be for service vehicles only. This restriction will be implemented via a future traffic order or other such similar measure. Amend Brief accordingly. A more detailed flood risk assessment has been produced for this section of the River Ness and it reveals that a small part of the proposed housing area lies within the 1 in 200 year risk area and this land should therefore be excluded from the area proposed for built development. Reduce new housing extent at Ness-side which is subject to flood risk and re-designate that land as part of expanded riverside open space area.</p>
<p>Inverness Rowing Club</p>	<p>Comments that it is making an individual and combined (with rugby and golf) sports clubs response. Believes it should be given priority status because it is the only such Club in Highland and has the best, longest stretch of water in Scotland. This unique location and asset should also not be diminished by West Link or the Brief's content.</p> <p>Expresses concern about the following issues.</p> <p>1 Blight and uncertainty which may affect Club membership, future investment and fundraising.</p> <p>2 Physical disruption to Club activities during and post West Link construction.</p> <p>3 Wants firm commitment on mitigation works including preservation of a 5,000m length of rowing course, no reduction in operational width of canal along this length, no impact on navigation and safety along this length, no impact on pontoons and jetties along this length, preservation of vehicular access to the Club building, and retention of unfettered along canal towpath access which is needed for safety reasons. Believes the additional pontoons / jetties proposed will threaten these requirements and that the new swing bridge should have greater clearance or an agreement to open for large Club events.</p> <p>4 Believes the extended waterspace / marina and its associated development will severely compromise the Club's canal frontage especially its existing pontoons, the safety of the Club's wider canal space usage and land used by the Club for parking and turning.</p> <p>5 Loss of existing parking areas on canal towpath and canal bank. Already insufficient provision and with growing membership problem will only worsen. Canal waterspace design does not guarantee dedicated car parking and turning for Club which is needed for major events. West Link scheme should create an adequate radius</p>	<p>The Club's role is recognised and it will be incumbent upon the Council to ensure the Club suffers no overall net detriment as a result of West Link and other Brief proposals. However, the Club is not directly affected by West Link and its list of demands are seeking considerable enhancement beyond the facilities it currently possesses and has legal control over.</p> <p>1 The Club will not be directly and permanently affected by West Link. The Council has chosen a route and is progressing the detail of it. This should provide sufficient certainty to retain and attract membership and funding.</p> <p>2 The Council accepts and will strive to minimise disruption during the West Link construction periods.</p> <p>3 TEC Services are having ongoing discussions with the Club regarding its operational issues. The West Link item to this committee addresses this matter. Amend Brief to replicate the canal-side facilities agreed to date through these discussions.</p> <p>4 The idea of an extended waterspace was suggested by canal users at the design workshop Charrette and accepted by the majority of those attending and was not suggested by the Council. It does have challenges in terms of feasibility notably because of the need for an unprogrammed fifth leg of the Torvean Roundabout and a direct physical impact on the scheduled monument canal. However, the principle of such provision has broad support and it is worthy of further consideration. If the canal waterspace development doesn't happen the land will remain as green or recreational space with no effect on Rowing Club operations. Add textual reference to Brief to establish that the developer of the extended waterspace proposal must ensure no overall net detriment to the existing Rowing Club facilities at this location.</p> <p>5 The Club's existing access, parking and turning works largely on a grace and favour basis. It is unreasonable for it to demand hugely improved provision without contributing to such provision. It would be more constructive to work with the Council and Scottish Waterways to create additional parking and turning areas close to the existing Club House. West Link will deliver an enhanced and safer vehicular access than exists at present. No Brief change.</p> <p>6 There is no intention to affect the Club's water supply indeed the West Link river bridge will be designed to carry higher capacity water mains to this part of the City. Mains electricity and public sewer connections are far more likely if the canal waterspace development happens but the Club's opposition to this is noted. No Brief change.</p> <p>7 There be little or no net loss of car parking at the Aquadome and Rugby Club as a result of West</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>vehicular connection to the towpath.</p> <p>6 Requires retention of mains water connection, demands mains electricity connection and queries possibility of mains sewerage connection.</p> <p>7 Believes that West Link leads to unacceptable net loss of car parking at rugby club and Aquadome that the Club uses for major events.</p> <p>8 Points out conflict West Link and Brief proposals for waterside/canal moorings/pontoons.</p> <p>9 Supports the concept of a Sports Hub building and would be interested in utilising facilities such as a fitness suite, changing rooms, meeting space plus shared use of social and parking facilities for the Club's large regatta events.</p>	<p>Link. No Brief change.</p> <p>8 See 3 above. Amend Brief to incorporate latest agreed canal-side facilities.</p> <p>9 See Sports Hub etc item to this Committee. The Club's desires are noted. Some of the facilities listed will be incorporated at the Hub but the expressed consensus supports its location away from the canal. Amend Brief to reflect the latest indicative layout and components of the Sports Hub and Golf Course Reconfiguration proposals.</p>
<p>Highland Rugby Club</p>	<p>Wishes land use arrangement revised so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land between Canal, Premier Inn and General Both Road freed up by relocation of Golf Course to be used for sports hub and future sport uses including indoor training facilities. 2. Proposals for Mixed Use Development adjacent to Premier Inn should be removed to take account of this. 3. Proposals for the Fitness Centre would fit better with their relocation to the area of land freed up by the relocation of the holes at Torvean Golf Club adjacent to A82, Canal West Link Road and proposed Marina. This would allow the Fitness Centre to be linked to Torvean Quarry and to Canal towpath. 	<p>1 & 2 It is accepted that the sports hub area should be larger to accommodate full standard size pitches (including run-off / safety areas) appropriate to the sports clubs that will use the facility. The indoor facilities will be limited to changing rooms and associated accommodation. Delete mixed use development area to rear of Premier Inn and caravan park and replace with enlarged Sport Hub area (incorporating golf course practice area).</p> <p>3 There is no proposal for a fitness centre, rather fitness and other trails which will not have a great land take. The amended West Link road scheme will include an A82 underpass which will resolve the safety issue in connecting to the existing quarry and canal towpath routes. Add West Link scheme changes including A82 underpass to Brief mapping and latest fitness and other trail routes.</p>
<p>Bennet / Clunas via agent</p>	<p>General support for Brief content especially recognition that development can take place reasonably close to powerlines. However, suggests some amendments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The land to the rear of the electricity sub-station on Dores Road designated for open ground storage should be broadened to a non-residential 'mixed-use' designation because there is no known demand for open ground storage use in Inverness and other uses may still be compatible with overhead powerlines and the sub-station proximity. This could be achieved by merging the pink and grey sites on Map 9. 2 Disputes Brief requirements to transfer essential infrastructure land 	<p>1 The tenant of the adjoining concrete batching plant utilises an open ground storage and sales display area and will require relocation. Warehousing would be an additional acceptable use subject to suitable road access. However, industrial process, retail, housing, community, public open space, office and institutional uses would not be acceptable here whereas the pink mixed use site is less constrained and should be flexible in terms of future use. Amend Brief text and mapping to add warehousing as an acceptable alternative use for the grey site.</p> <p>2 Where the Council is acquiring land this should be done using conventional valuation techniques. Amend Brief to reflect this change. The Council has provided a degree of equalisation of development costs and values across the Ness-side area by allowing all landowners the same ratio of housing units to developable land area. Non-developable land does not include land required for drainage infrastructure nor sports pitches because the locations of these facilities have a degree of flexibility. Included are "fixed" constraint areas such as set-back areas from existing woodland, flood</p>

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	at nil value and pay developer contributions towards such provision. Also believes there has been insufficient equalisation of developer cost and value across Ness-side particularly in terms of the sports pitch location. Queries whether non housing, community uses such as a church will be liable for developer contributions.	risk sources, high voltage overhead lines, and West Link. The Council believes that this approach is equitable. Developer contributions are sought in proportion to impact so a church proposal does not create or magnify education, open space, sports, affordable housing, public art or outdoor access deficiencies. It does create impacts in terms of traffic and public transport but vehicle movements will be limited and off peak and an existing bus route passes adjacent to the site. Accordingly, no off-site financial contributions will be sought for a church proposal. However, Map 9 defines a section of remote cycleway and landscaped set-back for the frontage of this site and these will be expected via direct developer funded provision. No further Brief change.
Cllr Graham Ross	Believes the riverside areas should have car parking and picnic areas because if parking is not provided then people will park in neighbouring residential areas creating a potential problem for residents.	The Brief attempts to promote active travel and recreation by identifying short walking circuits to, along and back from the riverside rather than a "side-of-road" picnic site. However, a lay-by is being added to the West Link scheme design to allow walkers to park on the riverside of the road and not have to cross it. See West Link item for detail of this change and add lay-by to Brief mapping.
Donald MacKenzie	Finds the idea of a "linear park" pathetic. Believes it is a slightly wide roadside ditch that will soon be dotted with shopping trolleys and other roadside detritus.	The riverside linear park will be a green corridor at least 40m in width, landscaped, managed and maintained to the Council's specification. No Brief change.
Margie Elgar - Bond	Supports West Link and the national Cycle Route extension into Inverness. Believes that the Dores Roundabout should be the urban edge and that land beyond towards Dores should be distinctly different and rural in character	Support welcomed and noted. The Brief promotes a gentle tapering of urban to rural uses at Milton of Ness-side to reflect this change in character. Although land at Ness Castle is earmarked for development it is not visible from the Dores Road and the Brief promotes the retention of Dores Road frontage woodland to maximise this rural feel. No Brief change.
Edward AB Kelsey	Welcomes the Council's choice of route for West Link and the journey time improvements it will bring. Also welcomes the new proposed sports facilities and new housing as wishes to buy a house in this area.	Support welcomed and noted. No Brief change.
Alex and Anne MacDonald	Welcome the marina proposal as a way to relocate Caley Cruisers and reduce the number of canal bridge openings.	Noted. Any marina would not be created exclusively for a particular company. No Brief change.
Ian and Gail MacDonald	Request deletion of green pecked footpath connection through their landholding adjacent to Holm Mills because it has been imposed without consultation, will only exacerbate the existing problem of public dog walker access which threatens their livestock, and cuts through their other place of business a vehicle repair workshop. The existing core path over their land was added illegally and should also be removed.	Remove path notation through landholding from Brief and substitute alternative provision between West Link Mill Lade Roundabout and Dores Road following common ownership boundary where possible. The content of the Inverness Core Path Plan cannot be changed until that document is next reviewed.

Source	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<p>Issues Raised at 15 April City of Inverness Area Committee and at Ward Business Meeting</p>	<p>During discussion, Members raised the following issues that required further action / decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Another public consultation event should be held in a central location convenient for City centre residents without access to a car. 2 There was a need to look at the adequacy of future school provision in the area. 3 Pedestrian and cyclist requirements should be addressed in the Brief as much as those of drivers. However, running and cycle tracks should not be promoted within Tomnahurich Cemetery. 4 Further clarification was required on the issue of development around power lines. 5 All three Inverness West Ward Members have requested the deletion of an affordable housing allocation east of Charleston View because of (unrecorded) neighbour opposition to it. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 A further (well attended) consultation event was undertaken at the Eastgate Centre on Saturday 4th May 2013. 2 A review of current and future school estate provision across the whole of Inverness is ongoing and will be considered by Members in due course. Meantime, the Brief leaves open the option of new school sites at both Charleston and Ness-side and secures developer contributions towards known education accommodation improvements. No Brief change. 3 See Brief changes above regarding increased active travel connections. Delete Brief content in terms of Tomnahurich Cemetery Running / Cycle routes. 4 The Brief has followed the principles set out in National Grid Guidance, "A Sense of Place" and combined this with evidence from Lands Tribunal cases where the issues of public safety and marketability have been tested in detail. The particular design of development in this location will be required to take account of both of these issues. There is no statutory set-back figure. However, the Brief requires a minimum 12m development set-back which is more than exists in the neighbouring Holm neighbourhood. No Brief change. 5 The site's development would result in the loss of a small area of greenspace but will not affect the adjacent play park and could deliver 6 affordable housing units on serviceable, Highland Council owned land. Recommendation that this site is removed.

APPENDIX 2 – VERBATIM RESPONSES TO DRAFT TORVEAN AND NESS-SIDE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

Source	Verbatim Comments
J Laird (02027)	(1) The proposed design is weak at integrating the housing development at Ness Side with the recreational facilities at Whin Park and the Bught unless one travels by car. Similarly it is weak at integrating the existing housing schemes at Locahardil and Holm Dell with the same recreational facilities unless one travels by car. There is a need for clear pedestrian, cyclist routes through the proposed development and over the new bridge over the River Ness. Currently in the design the roundabout at the southern (Ness Side) end of the bridge presents a formidable barrier to anyone wanting to walk and cycle. Pedestrian crossing facilities are needed. (2) Wouldn't it be better to route the Oban-Fort William - Inverness cycle path over the proposed new bridge and through the lovely parkland on the Bught side of the river, rather than threading it past an electricity sub-station and then down Dores Rd?
M & J Baldwin (02028)	As current residents of Ness-side we are concerned that there should be adequate surface water drainage facilities included in any development at Ness-side. It has been noticeable even since the construction of the Tesco store that our garden has become wetter and when it rains the road to Ness-side becomes a river which then runs into the garden of one of our neighbours, though the construction of the new road should help that problem. The older houses at Ness-side are low-lying relative to the proposed development land. We would therefore ask that you consider leaving some space between the existing houses and any new housing on the land between the west link road and the existing properties and that surface water be drained downstream from us. We would also like to think that there would be some screening between the existing properties and any new housing. We would also ask you to consider whether, as a developer contribution, the existing properties at Ness-side could be connected to mains drainage which presumably will be available close by.
J Smith (01991)	The Council's planning department's proposals for the development of lands in the Torvean and Holm areas are a credit to the planning profession - thoughtful, attractive, balanced, combining well laid out residential areas with essential community provision, and clever connections for footpaths, cycle routes and road access. The opening up of parkland, recreational and walking opportunities along the banks of the River Ness and the connections with the canal towpaths are great. I like the idea of a linear park, with footpaths alongside the River Ness in the Holm area. The SUDS ponds have great potential for wildlife enhancement if the appropriate shrubs and trees are used.
S Ross (01994)	As an Invernesian born and bred I have a long-time interest in the development and expansion of my town/city. This initial 'local-boy' interest developed considerably during my university studies when I eventually focussed in the late-glacial landscape systems in and around the town. Whilst appreciating the physical needs for development in the Ness-side/Torvean areas of the city and that there is no planned evidence of any significant physical damage to, or alteration of, our globally unique (in scale) set of landforms I do have some genuine concerns regarding the continued total preservation of Torvean and associated features. Briefly, the following are my concerns - (1) There is apparently no definitive statement in the Consultation Draft of an undertaking to preserve in its entirety for the future the 'culmination' feature of Torvean; (2) By increasing the housing/tourist/retail/commercial/recreational 'footprint' west of the Caledonian Canal we will maybe unintentionally yet inevitably increasing 'footfall' on or close to this already designated fragile site. Further information or confirmation of the fact that the published plans will not jeopardise Torvean or associated features would be appreciated.
SEPA (00523)	We generally welcome the content of the Development Brief however there are a number of issues which we raised in our previous response PCS/120637 dated 29 August 2012 which have not been fully addressed. We therefore object unless the modifications detailed below are undertaken. If the Development Brief is revised we would welcome the opportunity to provide further comments and would welcome on-going engagement as the master planning progresses. <u>Advice for the planning authority</u> Flood risk In Section 1 of our previous response we requested that the Development Brief contained a map clearly showing the areas within The Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) and that development avoided these areas. In addition we highlighted that development should not be located on top of existing culverts and that the location of existing culverts should be identified and the site layout revised accordingly. Whilst we welcome the reference in Section 6.6 to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment for any development proposed within the 1 in 200 year indicative flood plain, this does not fully address our concerns or highlight the potential constraints to developers. On the constraints map (Map 3) the flood outline doesn't tie in with the most recent flood extent produced by Capita Symonds in support of the West Link. This is the most

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>detailed and up-to-date information we hold for the area and shows more extensive flooding around Ness-side and Holm Mill than is shown on Map 3. We therefore object unless Map 3 is updated to reflect the most up to date flood information available.</p> <p>On Map 5 the tourism/retail/commerce area shown at Holm Mill is constrained by flood risk, though it is not clear if new development is proposed or whether the map reflects existing uses. Given the area is already developed, redevelopment to same sensitivity of land use or a less sensitive land use may be feasible though may require mitigation measures. The housing area shown just to the north of Ness-side (between the new road and River Ness) is partially within an area of flood risk and the indicative layout given would not be feasible. This could be misleading as to what there would be capacity to accommodate at that location. The elderly/community care accommodation closest to the river at Milton of Ness-side (small L-shaped building) may be at risk of flooding. In order to ensure that clear advice is available to developers we object unless new development allocations within the functional flood plain as shown within the most recent flood extent produced by Capita Symonds in support of the West Link are removed or where redevelopment is proposed, the proposed use is for development of the same sensitivity or a less sensitive land use. Guidance on land use vulnerability can be found in our Land Use Vulnerability Guidance.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion in the developer requirements of a Flood Risk Assessment for areas within or adjacent to the indicative floodplain. In order to ensure the development brief is in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy we object unless Section 6.6 is modified to state <i>"Produce a Flood Risk Assessment for any development within or adjacent to the 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk areas as shown on the Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) or any other more up to date information and demonstrate that the proposal comply with Scottish Planning Policy"</i>.</p> <p>We previously highlighted that it is thought that there are a number of culverted watercourses in the Torvean area of the land outlined in Maps 6-8. Building on top of old culverts would give us serious cause for concern and could have implications for the site layout. The location of these will have to be established then careful consideration given to how they are incorporated into any areas of development. We therefore object unless Section 6.6 includes a developer requirement which states something along the lines of <i>"There may be culverts present which could restrict the area of land available for development. A survey of existing culverts should be submitted in support of any planning application which demonstrates a minimum buffer of 6m to the culverts or other suitable mitigation which protects the watercourse whilst protecting the proposed and any existing development from flood risk."</i> The location of these culverts should be available from Highland Council's TEC services. We welcome the inclusion of the statement that additional culverting should be avoided.</p> <p>The advice contained in this letter is supplied to you by SEPA in terms of Section 72 (1) of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 on the basis of information held by SEPA as at the date hereof. It is intended as advice solely to The Highland Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 72 (1). Our briefing note entitled: <i>"Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009: Flood risk advice to planning authorities"</i> outlines the transitional changes to the basis of our advice inline with the phases of this legislation and can be downloaded from www.sepa.org.uk/planning/flood_risk.aspx.</p> <p>Watercourse buffers</p> <p>We welcome the requirements for a 6m buffer to all watercourses in Section 6.6. In Section 4 of our previous response we also asked for up to a 20m buffer to the River Ness.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise elements such as the West Link river crossing will be within this buffer, we note that some development is proposed at Ness-side that would be within 20m of the River Ness. It's unclear what exactly would be proposed and therefore to ensure developers are aware that there may be constraints we object unless the wording in Section 6.6 is modified to <i>"A minimum set back of 6m between the top of the bank of any water body and any proposed new development. This may be increased to up to 20m depending on site specific constraints including river morphology and flood risk"</i>.</p> <p>Existing groundwater abstractions</p> <p>In Section 5 of our previous response we requested that the existing groundwater abstractions within the 100 m radius of roads, tracks and trenches or 250 m radius from borrow pits and foundations were identified and the site layouts amended accordingly or that further assessment was carried out to ensure appropriate mitigation could be undertaken.</p> <p>This does not seem to have been considered within the Development Brief however given the proximity to the existing public water supply network we now consider that in most instances suitable mitigation, i.e. connection to the public water supply, will be available.</p> <p>It is important that developers are aware of the existing groundwater abstractions and the associated costs with providing an alternate water supply where applicable. We therefore object unless Section 6.6 contains text along the following lines. <i>"Where a development impacts upon an existing groundwater abstraction or water supply then</i></p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<i>suitable mitigation will be required</i> ’.
P A Martin (01959)	The lack of progress on this issue is symptomatic of the Council in its various guises over the years of not focusing on getting one issue right at a time. This badly conceived plan drags in so many issues that the project seems certain to fail them all. The so-called 'Sports Hub' is a nebulous concept just waiting to be hijacked by vested interests as it has no solid planning. And where did the marina come from - sounds like someone has just bought a boat. If protecting sporting green space was so important why has so much been eroded away over the years such as the construction of the 'Archive Centre', the loss of Queens Park as it was and the steady encroachment on the Bught itself. The Council has a big weight on its shoulders which is always dodged by bringing decisions to the full Council rather than allowing the local board decide. It must also think clearly and avoid poor decisions like the Bridge Street concrete carbuncle of the sixties. If thought out clearly the current plan can be better designed to make a lot more people happy and proud of infrastructure for our future.
J Craig (00703)	I would be pleased if you would give some consideration to the following observations. They are in part related to the on-going consultation on the Link Road proposals and have relevance in both cases. At a public meeting regarding the link road proposals, I pointed out that 75% of canal traffic through Tomnahurich Bridge was generated by Caley Cruisers vessels. If Caley Cruisers could be encouraged to relocate to the west of Tomnahurich Bridge, there would be a significant improvement in traffic conditions into Inverness from the Ft. William road and the requirement to provide a second crossing would be unnecessary. With the latest proposals by Scottish Waterways to enter into the construction of a marina development to the west of Tomnahurich Bridge, that initial observation of mine does not seem so farfetched. Where Scottish Waterways proposals are questionable though is in the following: - Marinas in general are not the "people friendly" environment they may be marketed as. Look at existing Muirtown Marina as a prime example. Security is the order of the day. Boat owners DO NOT like casual sightseers around their vessels and Keep Off notices prevail. Many vessels will be required to be removed from the water for either maintenance or insurance requirements over the winter months. This can be a hazardous and unsightly environment. Marinas are also for the foregoing reasons, a very seasonal facility. It is also fairly obvious that existing berth owners in Muirtown Basin would re-locate to the new facility, leaving berths for visitors at Muirtown. Scottish Waterways need to build their marina west of Dochgarroch Lock, but see an excellent opportunity to acquire a facility at a bargain price rather than deal with Dochfour Estate. I sincerely hope this is some value; it is not in any way meant to be anything other than constructive.
R Thomson Scottish Canals (01975)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leisure/small craft transit (waiting) pontoons required to the West of the new bridge 2. Traffic signs to read 'ROAD CLOSED' 'ROAD OPEN'
G Tuley (01999)	<p>I have been trying to understand this document but the maps are difficult to read. Could you please provide me with a set of maps which can be studied and aid understand of the proposals. It is not helpful to have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the legend and actual features at different scales — all of Map land pylons on Map 3 • several linear features superimposed on each other - Dores Road on Map 2 • features not included in the legend —solid purple lines on Map 2 • several features which appear to be the same —6 pink/red/purple stars on Map 2 • features only partially included — West Link Road has a cycleway on both sides on Map 5 <p>Paragraph 4.5 of the document states that completion of the West Link will improve "...opportunities for access to the City Centre particularly by walking and cycling.": can you please explain how this will be achieved by a road which is more or less an arc round the city centre.</p> <p>SECOND RESPONSE</p> <p>There are some errors in the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Brief paragraph 4.9 refers to map 2 but it should be map 3 • Development Brief paragraph 6.10 refers to connecting West Link at Queens Park when it means the Tomnahurich Roundabout to agree with West Link page 16. • The 1 in 200 year Flood Risk on Map 3 differs significantly from the 1 in 200 year Flood Extent on Page 6 of the West Link document I prefer the page 6 version <p>I have put this section of my letters to both Development Plans and Mr James A Smith of TEC Services because some points may be relevant to both parts of the Council.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>The Development Brief is dealing with 2 separate items in one document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allocating land for housing 2. Suggesting several options for new sports facilities <p>I think it would be premature to agree details of item 1 before the planning application for the West Link has been confirmed by Scottish Ministers after a local inquiry. If permission for the West Link is refused then the Council will have to decide on an alternative proposal which might involve land which may have been allocated for housing. If any land required for road building has been zoned for housing then it will be very expensive to acquire by a compulsory purchase order. The Aberdeen Bypass was subject to legal challenge after it had been approved by Scottish Ministers and that could happen in connection with the West Link.</p> <p>The proposal for the West Link will adversely affect the existing sporting facilities and so it will be necessary to include replacement facilities in the planning application. I am not sure whether this should be handled by "Development Plans", which is part of the "Planning Control" side of the Council, instead of "TEC Services" which is the Developer. Perhaps this does not matter because few if any of the Councillors who are part of the Planning Committee, especially the chairman, are in a position to consider the application because they have disqualified themselves because of strong public statements about the West Link.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT</p> <p>This is part of the documentation for the West Link as page 14 but it needs to be considered in relation to the Development Brief. On page 14 it says:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landscape effects — Potential impacts - Intrusion on tranquil character of riverside setting and future riverside park 2. Noise and Vibration — Potential impacts — On residents; users of recreational routes and facilities; some wildlife — Effects — Potential increase in noise levels <p>Page 6 of the same document has the title "Environmental Constraints" and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our environmental assessment considers impacts upon ... Increase in noise or air pollution 2. Schedule of Completed Surveys ... Noise receptors <p>When the different options were under consideration the visual effect on the riverside park and sports area was not considered and neither was the noise and air pollution. Questions I would like answered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the survey of noise receptors? Please can I have a copy? • Is the consideration to be of noise or air pollution or are both to be investigated? <p>I assume that the noise and air pollution alongside the existing Southern Distributor is the reason why there is an earth bund covered in trees bordering this road. It does not appear that this has been included in the proposals for the Development Brief for Ness-Side. It has not been considered as part of the West Link proposal because the videos available on the Council website show the road constructed through fields.</p> <p>It was deemed desirable, or necessary, to include a tree covered earth bund between the existing Southern Distributor road and the golf course. If this is necessary to "protect" somebody who spends about 5 minutes playing hole of golf then it is even more important for those playing a rugby match for 80 minutes. The rugby players will spend part of the match away from the edge of the pitch but is essential that all of them can hear the referee's whistle. On one pitch the poor linesman will have to spend 40 or 80 minutes right up to the edge of the road. Any spectators would not want to experience this noise and will only use the other side of the pitch. If there is an earth covered bund then the space available for the rugby pitches will be reduced. According to Sport Scotland the full size dimensions for a Rugby Union pitch are 100m x 70m with in goal areas between 10m and 22m plus a safety margin of 5m on all sides which means the minimum area needed is 130m by 80m.</p> <p>The Development Brief page 21 has a scale on it but no dimensions for the size of the pitches and West Link Scheme Proposals Sheet 2 state the scale is 1:1000 at A1 but does not include dimensions of the pitches. I am unable to work out what the figures on the sizes of 2 rugby pitches refer to — size of pitch, pitch plus in goal, or pitch plus in goal and safety margin. If new facilities are to be created then they should be full sized.</p> <p>Measuring the distance between the housing on both sides of the West Link road on the Indicative Masterplan Ness-side [using the A3 copy] indicates about 33m between the houses. The West Link Scheme Proposals Sheet 3 has a blue dashed line with the explanation "25m exclusion zone to building development — from edge of new carriageway". Adding two exclusion zones to 7m width of carriageway gives 57m which is considerable more than 33m.</p> <p>I repeat the question in my letter of 27 April 2013:</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5 of the document states that completion of the West Link will improve "...opportunities for access to the City Centre particularly by walking and cycling." can</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>you please explain how this will be achieved by a road which is more or less an arc round the city centre.</p> <p>OTHER ITEMS</p> <p>Core paths are shown on Map 2 and not considered as Constraints on Map 3. Some of these will be eliminated and on page 19 of the West Link it acknowledges that Stopping Up Orders and Re-Determination of Public Rights of Passage Orders will be required. Building houses is the main reason for the paths being terminated. In paragraph 4.9 waste water networks are mentioned but are not shown in Map 3 but it is harder to move waste water uphill than it is water and gas.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2 includes:</p> <p>Improved access to the riverside greenspace, helping residents and visitors enjoy the natural and built environment by the river and canal; There is no footpath shown near the river and what is called Remote Footpath is shown alongside the West Link road which is right alongside the road — not an improvement and not something to enjoy. On the south side of the rugby pitches in West Link Scheme Proposals Sheet 2 a proposed 3m wide Footpath/Cycletrack is shown which joins the West Link road but Map 5 shows this as a Remote Footpath which goes under the new road to link to the Tow Path. There must be routes away from the West Link road that are suitable for walkers and cyclists for people to “enjoy”.</p> <p>Revitalising the Caledonian Canal and River Ness [paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5] will adversely affect the Caledonian Canal Listed Monument by making a big hole in the wall to gain access to a new marina and a mass of new houses disguised in the document as “Loch side development” and “Tourism/Residential Development” and “Jacobite Reception Cafe and Pier”. At an earlier meeting I was told that the idea of an Urban Village on the golf course had been dropped but is has reappeared under a new name. A mass of houses instead of a golf course is not going create “A green gateway with a clear identity that is distinctive and vibrant” which is the first sentence of the shared vision on page 3. What is at present “natural” will become “built” when part of the towpath been changed to “Torvean and Ness-side” instead of “Ness-side and Charleston” so that the Council can get as much development as possible on land it owns? Is that the reason why the development is coloured blue and pink which are not shown on the Legend on the map on page 20?</p> <p>Paragraph 5.16 says that Map 6 is the base map to allow delivery of the West Link but the Point of View video does not show the road access into the Tourism/Retail/Commerce area by the canal but the map shows the Marina as essential, why?</p> <p>Map 9 shows 3 proposed crossings associated with the West Link but these are not included in the West Link building proposals. Map 2 includes as a yellow line to show National Cycle Network 78 (Proposal) which is supported in paragraph 5.3 but in map 9 the route is only shown along 40% of the length of Dores Road. It must be along the whole length of the road.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.24 why do we need another roundabout at Milton of Ness-side? If it becomes a busy junction then traffic lights would be safer for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Shared cycleway/footpaths must be 3m wide not 2m wide as indicated under developer contributions for Outdoor Access (page 27).</p>
<p>H Barron (02046)</p>	<p>Owns Charleston Farm which is proposed to accommodate the substantial relocation of Torvean Golf Course in terms of the Torvean & Ness-side Development Brief. Under the existing adopted Local Plan, a substantial part of my client’s land is zoned for residential development. Under the proposals contained within the Torvean & Ness-side Development Brief the majority of his land is zoned for a golf course with a much reduced area zoned for residential development. Accordingly we wish to object to the proposals contained within the development brief as they significantly reduce the development potential of my client’s land.</p>
<p>Stagecoach (02044)</p>	<p>T+N Development Brief</p> <p>Stagecoach expressed concern with regard to planners defining where buses go in the new housing development: if buses aren't catered for adequately in the housing development, there would be a need on the link road for bus routes. Route through housing should be as close to the houses as possible. TECs noted that this would be conveyed to the planners. SW does not see buses going across the River Ness bridge to take people from Dores Road area to Whin Park as commercially viable. Bus stops preferable to bus laybys as they avoid buses having to pull out again. Stagecoach does not see buses going across the River Ness bridge to take people from Dores Road area to Whin Park as commercially viable. Bus stops preferable to bus laybys as they avoid buses having to pull out again.</p> <p>Sports Hub</p> <p>Stagecoach would be keen to support any park and ride scheme in the long term, however expressed doubt as to its viability as he thinks people driving into Inverness from the A82 would carry on rather than turning left to travel along General Booth Road and park then get a bus back along GB road. Stagecoach would prefer a layby/bus stop on General Booth Road as opposed to pulling into a transport hub as this increases journey time.</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
<p>00676 G H Johnston on behalf of the Cardrona Trust</p>	<p>We act on behalf of the Cardrona Charitable Trust, owners of land at Ness-side Fields in the southern part of the Ness-side area. We also act for Mr & Mrs Donald Macdonald, owners of the adjoining property at Milton of Ness-side. You will be aware that in November 2010 we commenced formal pre-application procedures for a mixed use development on the Ness-side Fields land. The submission of a planning application with a master plan layout was delayed due to the assertion by Planning officials that it would be premature to the review of the local development plan provisions and the need to undertake an options appraisal of the West Link Road. We were also advised at the time that you would not support mainstream housing on the land despite our contention that the Inverness Local Plan does allow for this. We stated our case for this in great detail in submissions to both Highland wide and Inner Moray Local Development Plans. However, it was clear from the charrette process that there is public support for some housing on the land. Having studied the provisions of the draft Development Brief and Master Plan, we now note that our original proposals are reflected. Unfortunately, in the two and a half years that have passed some of the developer interest in providing healthcare related uses on the land has since come and gone. It now remains to be seen if such development, which was proposed by charitable organisations, will re-appear. Nevertheless, we welcome the recognition of the development potential in the draft Brief, as previously put forward at the pre-application consultation stage. We also consider that the provisions of whole Brief have been well considered and offer a suitable, even if long overdue, framework for the future development of the south west part of the city. We now look forward to the Council progressing to finalise the Brief and the West Link Road as soon as possible to provide certainty for developers or potential investors. With regard to the detailed development of land on the north side of the Holm Burn, our clients ask that appropriate tree hold backs and protection areas are maintained from the adjoining woodland. This woodland is owned by Mr & Mrs Macdonald, who remain in dispute with The Council over the damage done by contractors to the local environment, including trees, on their property in the course of carrying out the Flood Relief Channel works. .</p>
<p>01209 Burt Boulton Holdings</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This response to the published draft Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief (the brief) has been prepared on behalf of Burt Bolton Holdings Ltd the owners of the site at Dores Road, Inverness. The response has been prepared on behalf of Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd (referred to simply as the owners) by Ian Kelly MRTPI, the Head of Planning at Graham and Sibbald, planning and development advisors to the site owners. Additional input has been provided by Iain Leighton FRICS, Senior Partner, based at the Graham and Sibbald office in Inverness. 2. As the Council Planning Officers will recall there have been discussions over a number of years about the redevelopment of this site. It remains the intention of the owners to secure a residential redevelopment of the site, implemented by others, in a way that maximises the achievable development value. That means having regard to key planning criteria as well as to market considerations. The response has been prepared on that basis and it is to be hoped that there can be further productive dialogue with the Council's Planning Officers. 3. The brief invites the submission of "comments". Those comments will "be considered" by the Council. However, no clear process is set out for the resolution of clear differences of opinion or for the resolution of outright concerns, during that "consideration". The owners are of the clear view that the issues raised in the draft brief, whether agreed or not, are of such serious planning and financial importance to a range of interested parties that some independent evaluation and resolution process needs to be put in place. In anticipation of such a process these submitted comments should be regarded, overall, as forming an objection to the brief. 4. It does, however, remain the view of the owners that the issues raised are capable of being resolved. <p>Planning History</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. As the response is initially being lodged directly with the Council for consideration by the Council, as set out in the brief, it is not considered that it is necessary to recount Ness-side Development Brief – Response – Burt Boulton Holdings the full detail of the whole planning history of the site stretching back many years. However, there are a few key considerations as set out below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The principle of the residential redevelopment of this site has been established for many years especially with the allocation of the site in the earlier Inverness Local Plan (the retained parts of which continue to support the development of the site) b. The frontage of the site has previously benefited from planning permission, which had been renewed, for residential development with direct access to Dores Road – a development of around 30 to 35 units was envisaged, possibly more if densities were higher c. As agreed with the Council in discussions in late 2011 and early 2012, rather than renew that permission again, detailed and formal pre-application discussions were held with the Council in respect of a potential new outline planning application for residential development of the whole site d. However, following those discussions and having regard to the Council's wish for a masterplanning approach for the Ness-side area and the likely range of studies that

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>would be requested for a stand alone application, it was agreed, on balance, to wait until the Council had progressed the preparation of the brief</p> <p>e. The site owners and their planning consultants were then represented at the Charrette workshop held by the Council in September 2012 and expressed a number of concerns about the emerging masterplan</p> <p>f. In the interim further discussions were held with Council Officers about the development of the site, the proposed alignment of the West Link Road, key infrastructure issues that arose following the Charrette, and a range of concerns were set out in those discussions</p> <p>6. Having regard to the lengthy planning history and to the summary points above it is the firm hope of the site owners that a final version of the brief can be agreed in early course in order to allow them to fully evaluate their property management/development options and to make an early start on marketing at least part, if not all, of the site for residential development should that be appropriate.</p> <p>7. The following response to the brief is set out in two parts – a response to the final proposed alignment of the West Link Road in the vicinity of the Burt Boulton site (in terms of the impact on the development interests) and a response/objection to the brief itself.</p> <p>Ness-side Development Brief – Response – Burt Boulton Holdings</p> <p>Response to the Development Brief</p> <p>12. In considering the comments below the Council should understand that the owners do not give their agreement to the terms of the brief, and the associated masterplan, as they currently stand. It is considered that there are fundamental land use allocations, delivery procedures and viability issues that remain to be addressed.</p> <p>13. It is appreciated that there are some infrastructure issues, such as the sewerage disposal strategy and infrastructure, that are still being progressed by others and that will almost certainly affect the final development layouts and the detailed consideration of the brief. For example, the owners would be very concerned if the sewerage disposal and water drainage strategy resulted in a single large SUDS pond occupying a significant amount of otherwise developable land in their ownership or if they were expected to provide the annotated “green space” on their own. As will be addressed in a number of the responses below, unless there is an equitable and reasonable basis for the funding and delivery of what are communal items then it is likely that all landowners will need to review their approach to developments in Ness-side and to the associated funding of wider infrastructure issues.</p> <p>14. However, in order to move forward within the timescale envisaged by the Council this response simply addresses the draft brief as published.</p> <p>15. The responses below follow the heading and numbering system used in the draft brief:</p> <p>a. Sections 1 to 4</p> <p>i. No technical comments are offered in response to these introductory sections of the brief although it should be noted that, since the Charrette, various land uses have been relocated without any agreement with landowners and without any agreement on funding mechanisms. These points are picked up in relevant sections below</p> <p>b. Section 5 Development Framework</p> <p>i. The principles of the green gateway and enhanced sporting hub are considered to be appropriate. However, facilities that will be used by the wider public should be funded by that wider public and not just by the landowners in the brief area</p> <p>ii. A well connected place is important but it should not lead to overspend on transportation infrastructure that will not be well used. For example, the provision of high class cycling facilities in these new development areas is unlikely to materially increase the percentage of overall trips made by this mode unless there is a radical change in the provision of for cyclists elsewhere in the City (and wider area). This suggest that a sensible, balanced approach is needed to transportation infrastructure</p> <p>iii. The use of the principles from “Designing Streets” is supported but it is considered that slavish importation of this guide does not necessarily produce good design that is seen as being attractive and of value by the house buyer. This is especially the case in Inverness where there is no history of developments of this type being brought forward and sold in the marketplace</p> <p>iv. In terms of densities and design it should be noted that higher densities do not bring higher land values, indeed the opposite can be the case. This is a particular aspect of the general point, made later, that the Council needs to publish its assessment of the overall financial viability of what they propose in the masterplan</p> <p>v. Map 5 shows a fairly detailed indicative masterplan for the whole brief area. Looked at in the detail provided this appears to be over prescriptive, especially in the location of development blocks. It is understood that this Map 5 was properly meant to be “indicative” and principally indicative of the design principles and the “public” land uses such as roads and parks. If that is the case then it should be made clear in the wording</p> <p>vi. For Ness-side, para 5.23 to 5.28, the housing numbers in Table 2 are noted in so far as the owner’s interest is concerned. However, as indicated earlier, higher densities</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>do not tend to produce better returns on a price per acre basis nor do they necessarily have a beneficial effect on the overall development viability</p> <p>vii. The above point is particularly relevant when considering para 5.26. Whilst the basic approach of the Council to the allocation of housing land numbers to reflect the brief's requirement for infrastructure on individual landowners interests is understood, the equation simply will not work in practice. Being allowed to develop at a higher density will not allow for the recovery of proceeds that would otherwise have been raised from the residential development of land that is to be taken for infrastructure, including a large SUDS pond</p> <p>c. Ness-side Indicative Masterplan – Map 9</p> <p>i. Subject to the caveats mentioned earlier the owners are prepared to agree the principle of the West Link Road alignment and the location of the Mill Lade roundabout. The West Link Road and the existing Dores Road will then provide the main transport corridors serving the development areas on this side of the River Ness</p> <p>ii. However, given the above, the two proposed additional link roads through the Ness-side development area, that are shown on Map 9, are considered to be an excessive requirement, in the context of the overall quantum of development for this area even if frontage access is allowed (the brief text mentions “an internal distributor road” in para 5.6, but two are shown on Map 9). It is considered that the routes could also become traffic “rat runs” unless controls were in place. It is understood that there are local concerns that this effect could spread into adjoining streets</p> <p>iii. It is considered that the transportation objectives for these road links could be more easily and efficiently achieved, with provisions for design flexibility, by requiring connectivity between the different development areas – there being no need for bus connectivity as the bus routes are likely to be on Dores Road and the new West Link Road – along with provision for link roads to connect to Dores Road or by a further junction, perhaps a south bound left in and left out junction, on the West Link Road itself. The provision of two direct link dedicated roads as shown in the draft brief Map 9 is considered to be an expensive extravagance that could have an adverse effect on development economics</p> <p>iv. Consideration also needs to be given to the connection between the Mill Lade roundabout and Dores Road (it is understood that the Council might want this as a “buses only” link). That consideration needs to take account of the existing access to Dores Road from the owner's site – and the agreement that the owner's land can have a first phase development accessed directly from Dores Road. The preference of the owners is that a bus only link is developed along the mutual boundary between their land and the site owned by Mr Iain Macdonald to the immediate north, up to and joining Dores Road. The land needed for this link should be included in the CPO area. It is appreciated that this then leads to two junctions onto Dores Road – the existing junction serving the owner's site and a buses only junction to the north. The owners are sure that this can be engineered in a satisfactory way</p> <p>v. If the above suggestion is not possible then a fundamental rethink will be needed in respect of this transportation aspect of the brief. Any proposal to provide the link within the land to the north but to require a connection to the Burt Boulton land could lead to ransom and development delay issues. Any proposal to divert the link south into the owner's land is likely to adversely affect the layout of early phase residential layouts and might even create “dead ground” that could not be accessed for development</p> <p>vi. Finally, the owners would want to be able to secure development on their land right up to the proposed boundary of the West Link Road rather than having the development areas limited to those shown in Map 9</p> <p>d. Section 6 – Delivery</p> <p>i. It is considered of the utmost importance that the brief sets out precisely how the Council sees the implementation process moving forward in a fair and equitable basis. It is essential that there is a basis for progressing and funding development that does not “punish” some landowners through the suggested location of communal items and “reward” others who have only revenue earning development allocations. It is considered that the Council will need to take some form of co-ordinating role for the overarching aspects as well as determining the planning applications. However, equally, individual landowners need to be able to independently progress the viable development of their land, within the ambit of the agreed, adopted brief. The integration of these processes needs to be addressed urgently or the reality will be that the land will simply not be made available for either development or infrastructure or communal facilities in the way envisaged by the Council in the brief</p> <p>ii. The suggested developer contributions in Table 4 are noted subject to the following comments</p> <p>iii. There is clearly an overall question of viability given current land values. As mentioned a number of times, the brief really needs to be accompanied by a detailed financial appraisal/viability study. That study also needs to set out clearly what the fall back mechanisms will be in the event of either a funding shortfall for a particular item or in the event of a default by a contributor. Without this level of information the landowners are being asked to sign a blank cheque and that simply will not happen</p> <p>iv. The title of the table should be changed to landowner contributions as that will more accurately identify who is paying for the eventually agreed provisions</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>v. On the 25% affordable housing contribution this is a real cost burden to the landowner but that costing has not been include in the table – it is submitted that it should be</p> <p>vi. Detail is also needed, in the brief, on how the affordable housing is to be delivered and on the fall back position – for example, if no RSL or similar funding or funded developer partner is available at the start of any particular development phase the 25% requirement should be dropped. If the Council does not agree with this then it should set out the alternatives otherwise this requirement could be a block on development proceeding</p> <p>vii. There is a wider public benefit associated with the West Link Road and its funding and that should be explicitly addressed in the detail in the table 4</p> <p>viii. Whilst it is accepted that developers should contribute towards local public transport infrastructure – such as bus stops and information systems – it is less clear why they should be asked to subsidise the services themselves as these are either commercial undertakings or subsidised generally by the Council</p> <p>ix. Comment has already been made about the Sports Hub – there is a wider public benefit in this facility that requires to be reflected in its suggested funding package</p> <p>x. The funding for the (still to be agreed) sewerage and water disposal proposals still needs to be addressed, agreed and added to the table 4 so that the full extent of developer contributions can be seen and can form the basis of negotiated agreement involving the landowners</p> <p>xi. At that stage it is submitted that a review will be needed on the planned phasing of the eventually agreed contributions in order to avoid the scenario of the contributions, combined with say lower than expected land values, stifling development through resulting in land not being brought forward. This serious issue of landowners deciding not to release land for development as a result of the low net price (after so called developer contribution and affordable housing deductions from existing lower land values) has already been seen elsewhere and it is considered to be a serious planning issue that is worthy of mitigation</p> <p>xii. Having regard to all of the above, and as stated earlier there is clearly an overall question of viability given current land values. The brief really needs to be accompanied by a detailed financial appraisal/viability study based on realistically achievable current and future land values. That study also needs to set out clearly what the fall back mechanisms will be in the event of either a funding shortfall for a particular item or in the event of a default by a contributor. Currently, there is a considerable concern that the brief “package” is close to being either not viable or at least unattractive (such that land will not come forward for development).</p> <p>e. Developer Requirements – Para 6.6</p> <p>i. It is considered that the Council should not be given land or wayleaves free of charge. Rather these transfers should be agreed in the normal way based on established valuation principles</p> <p>ii. The same point applies in relation to the land for the West Link Road where a CPO is to be promoted</p> <p>iii. All parties should bear their own consents, orders and legal costs and the Council should not be reimbursed in this regard</p> <p>f. Phasing – Para 6.7 – 6.10</p> <p>Ness-side Development Brief – Response – Burt Boulton Holdings</p> <p>i. Broadly the suggested phasing is considered to be reasonable</p> <p>g. Section 7 – Next Steps</p> <p>i. This is addressed in the conclusions and submission below</p> <p>16. The Council is respectfully requested to address all of the above matters prior to proceeding with the proposed adoption of the brief.</p> <p>Conclusions and Submission</p> <p>17. As set out earlier it is considered that, until all matters are resolved, this response to the brief must be classified as an objection. However, Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd and their advisors would be pleased to meet with the Council Officers to discuss any aspect of this response. Indeed, it is considered that a meeting in early course would be very helpful given the seriousness of the concerns set out in this response.</p> <p>18. The draft brief, at 7.1, sets out the proposed next stages. Comments are to be considered by the Council and a revised version of the brief will then be reported back to the City of Inverness and Area Committee for adoption as Supplementary Guidance. The draft brief states that the adopted brief would then be a “material consideration” in the determination of planning applications. In fact it would have the same status as the Development Plan under the provisions of the new Planning procedures.</p> <p>19. However, in a scenario where the Council does not accept or agree all of the responses lodged in response to the draft brief, this would mean that the key determinant for all future planning applications in this area, and the key influence on development viability/attractiveness/deliverability, would be adopted without the Council's position ever having been tested by way of oral evidence. Whilst it is appreciated that legislation does provide for this process it is still, nonetheless, potentially unfair on both landowners and developers. The process will also fundamentally affect whether or not land is brought forward for development.</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>20. Therefore, it is respectfully recommended to the Council that, prior to the adoption of the brief, that the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. First, publishes a revised version of the draft brief that takes account of the submitted comments and that includes the requested financial appraisal/viability study b. Secondly, considers carefully all submissions on that second draft brief and the associated financial information c. Thirdly, for all remaining unresolved responses/objections, appoints an independent expert to conduct an informal Inquiry, by way of a Hearing session for interested parties, into any remaining unresolved comments and/or submissions. That whole re-consultation and informal Inquiry process should, if undertaken efficiently and effectively, only take around 5 to 6 months <p>21. Overall, unless these concerns/objectives are addressed in a positive way there is a very real concern that the brief will simply end up discouraging development – exactly the opposite of what was intended.</p>
<p>02063 Carolyn Thain</p>	<p>Ref Maps, 6,7 & 8 Previous comments made via the Inverness West Side pre planning application web page. We have concern for our privacy and potential for future flooding should the housing development be agreed and built so close to our home as it appears in the draft maps. Rear of 55 Millerton Avenue.</p> <p>We experienced a long term flooding issue last year from the recent Robertsons development which required intervention from Cllr Graham and TECS Flood prevention team.</p> <p>We have no issue with the housing development in general or the overall proposals but ask that consideration is given to the proximity of new houses in relation to our home. Please include us in any future consultation/proposals or planning application in order that we can make formal representation at the relevant time if necessary.</p> <p>COMMENTS RECEIVED BY TECS</p> <p>We have real concerns regarding the close proximity of proposed new housing at the rear of Millerton Avenue.</p> <p>On the proposed plan, the distance between the current properties and new properties at the rear of our home appears to be so close it will impact on our privacy.</p> <p>The field and path at the rear of our property along without own garden was subject to flooding from the current development last year and involved intervention from Cllr Graham and TECS Flood Prevention Team, this caused us a great deal of personal stress and have concerns for similar issues arising with future development.</p> <p>We have no issues with the development of houses and welcome the overall proposals for this major project but ask that consideration is given to our concerns in relation to the distance between our home and the new housing development.</p> <p>We would like to be informed of any further proposals/planning application in order that we can make formal representation if necessary at the appropriate time.</p> <p>We would appreciate an official response to these comments.</p>
<p>02062 Robert McKinnon</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Robertson Homes Limited [RHL] welcome the opportunity to be able to provide a formal response to the proposed Torvean & Ness-side Development Brief, which, as the Council will be aware has a significant impact on RHL's landholdings within Westercraigs. RHL share & welcome the vision of Highland Council for this particular area of Inverness, and that we too would like to see "a green gateway, with a clear identity that is distinctive and vibrant. A successful place that that builds on the heritage of the area and revitalises the canal and the river for both locals and tourists. A safe place that provides for new communities and businesses that is well connected to the City. An enhanced sporting hub for the City that can be used by a wide range of users. A place that respects and preserves the existing special qualities".</p> <p>Policy Context</p> <p>RHL welcome the continued allocation of the Charleston lands for "future" development. RHL contend that these lands should however, be wholly allocated for residential development, which would be in-line with Westercraigs masterplan, which benefits from Outline Planning Consent, that being reference 03/00676/OUTIN. Although the Charleston lands were not included within this Masterplan, the arising housing unit numbers were included within those associated with the above referenced consent. RHL welcome Policy 8 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, as this sets the context within which the road connection between Leachkin and General Booth Roads will be delivered, which will further enhance the connectivity from our Westercraigs site to the wider City. However, in the delivery of the road connection as narrated above, Highland Council should be aware that the proposed route as identified is only capable of provide a link that has a 6.5m carriageway width with 2m footway one side and 3m shared use on the other side. This would create an 11.5m corridor width, within an area at its narrowest that measures some 13.45m. RHL have prepared a detailed proposal of this formation, and can provide this if requested by the Council to effectively demonstrate such a proposal. It should be noted that Golf View Road to the north of</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>the access is only around 5.5m and to the south is around 6.3m in width both with footways of 1.8m to 2m width on either side according to plans obtained by RHL. Therefore it may be out of character with the other local roads in the area if a significantly wider road such as the 16.5m corridor was feeding into them was sought by the Council. RHL would also wish to see that the provision of this road connection was undertaken in such a way as to avoid any "3rd party" issues occurring, and the Council, where necessary using their power of CPO to procure all and any essential land for the creation of this link. It should also be noted that this link road may require off-site augmentation to the existing and surrounding road network, RHL would see the responsibility of such works falling to the Council as roads authority, again to avoid any potential "3rd party issues" occurring. RHL however, object to the removal of part of the previously identified and allocated residential developable land that had been identified to the south west of the Charleston lands, adjacent to what RHL know as the "green wedge". We would content, that this element of the site should be retained for residential development, and NOT re-classified as amenity space.</p> <p>Development Framework</p> <p>Whilst RHL support the principles of the Development Brief as being consulted upon, RHL OBJECT to not being fully involved in the preparation of the Indicative Masterplan for the Charleston lands as detailed within Map 5 of the proposed Development Brief.</p> <p>RHL, who represent the existing owners, that being NHS Highland, would have thought that prior to the Council embarking on the preparation of such fundamental planning policy, that will shape the future of the City of Inverness, that there would be have been full collaboration with all of the principle land owners who have an interest in this part of the City. The failure of the Council to undertake such an exercise, could have severe and fundamental delivery issues that could have easily have been resolved during the preparation of this Development Brief. The Council have also made some very fundamental decisions in terms of the delivery and sighting of major element of infrastructure e.g. SUDS ponds, without the knowledge held by land-owners/ developers, which may render this brief, again as undeliverable. If the Council had undertaken a more robust Masterplanning exercise, and involve all interested parties at an early stage, then there would have been no need for this objection from a party who are fundamental in the delivery of the Charleston lands. Having reviewed Section 5 in detail, and specifically with regards to the Torvean, RHL would make the following observations/ comments:</p> <p>5.16 – RHL object to the ineffective use of the "green space" which is identified adjacent to the Golf Course. We would contend that this area should be effectively included within the reconfigured golf course, so that this area makes a better and more effective contribution to the wider area.</p> <p>5.18 – RHL welcome that Charleston will be developed for Housing, however, RHL would require the inclusion of a caveat that states that "these figures are indicative, and subject to change once a more detailed development layout has been produced". The concern that RHL have is that to have a "Houses High" figure, with no statement that these are subject to more detailed layout work being undertaken, could negatively constrain housing numbers.</p> <p>5.19 – RHL have NOT been asked for their aspirations in terms of housing numbers, and the NHS have also confirmed that this statement is also false. Therefore, RHL object to this statement being used, and would like this removed. Such a statement infers that the landowners are content with such housing numbers/ allocation, which is certainly NOT the case for RHL.</p> <p>5.21 – See our comments above at 5.16. We support the continued use and expansion of the Golf Course, but NOT at the detriment of land controlled by RHL. Delivery RHL object to only Developer Contributions being shown that relate solely to residential development. If a robust Development Brief is to be prepared, and approved by Council, then this matter requires to be robustly documented, so that each developer, residential or otherwise, knows exactly what [if any] their financial obligations/ burdens will be. This will ensure that all development brought forward makes its fair and equitable contribution to such improvements, which will be for the benefit of the wider community. It is the view of RHL that it is unfair of the Council to infer within this document that all contributions will be sought purely from residential development, given that the Development Brief includes vast areas of Mixed Use. This requires to be addressed within any future publication of the Development Brief.</p> <p>Developer Requirements</p> <p>RHL have reviewed these matters in detail, and would comment on these are follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHL object to the first statement. In that we will NOT be held to ransom by any 3rd party owner, who could hinder the production and progression of the Charleston land. We also object to the statement that any proposal much accord with the land uses as shown. Without any commercial of indeed supporting evidence base that the "Mixed use" areas within the Charleston area viable, then RHL would content that flexibility is needed here, with the fall-back being a wholly residential development being brought forward; • RHL object to the assumption that all land needed by the Council will be conveyed at NIL value. This is a sweeping commercial statement that has NO place within a

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>Development Brief. This is very much a commercial process, for the Council to negotiate with the relevant land-owners, and then pay the prevailing market value for such land;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHL object to the statement that “all land required for the provision of the Inverness West Link Road and accommodation works” where the Council are again, seeking such land to be transferred to the Council at NIL value. Like above, this is a commercial process that the Council requires to undertake, and for the Council to negotiate with the relevant land-owners, and then pay the prevailing market value for such land. This statement has NO place within a Development Brief; • RHL wish to see such contributions means tested against the backdrop of providing effectively development, as opposed to constraining development by way of further developer contributions; <p>Phasing</p> <p>RHL object to the proposed phasing of the Charleston lands. At present these are programmed to come forward on the completion of the canal crossing and connection to the A82 at Torvean. However, it is noted from the Development Brief, that the site owned by the Barron Family, which is adjacent to Charleston is due to commence following the completion of Phase 2. It should be noted by the Council that given the proximity of this site to Charleston, that both should be similarly constrained, which is not the case. If the Council insist upon such a delay in terms of the Charleston lands, then such a constraint should also be attached to the Barron Family site, as both require the link road to be in-place and operational.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>RHL support the principles of the Development Brief, but as outlined above, have concerns about the way within which this was prepared, and some of the sweeping statements and assumptions made by the Council within this Development brief. RHL would ask that the Highland Council consider these objections in detail, and take these into full account when publishing the final version of this Development Brief.</p>
<p>02060 SNH</p>	<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to safeguard the interests of the River Moriston Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and existing green networks, we recommend amending the wording of three of the existing bullet points within the ‘Developer Requirements’ section of the development brief. These should be amended to the following: Produce a revised strategic Drainage Impact Assessment to enable the development of a strategic approach to sustainable drainage across Ness-side and to safeguard the water quality of the River Ness; • All development must connect to the public water and waste water networks, which must have sufficient capacity to avoid impacts on the River Moriston SAC and Moray Firth SAC respectively; • Safeguarding of existing green network features (people and wildlife), and linkage of greenspaces within the development to the green network both within the site and linking to the wider green network of adjacent sites, including the safeguard of land for the linear riverside greenspace to the west of the Link Road. <p>To safeguard the interests of the River Moriston SAC and the Torvean Landforms Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) we also recommend the inclusion of two additional bullet points in the ‘Developer Requirements’ section. These should state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of any adverse effects on the adjacent Torvean Landforms Site of Special Scientific Interest. • Water quality of River Ness to be protected during construction works (particularly at Ness-side) by production and approval of a Construction Method Statement to avoid pollution and sediment run-off. <p>The construction of a new marina in on the Caledonian Canal could lead to an increase in boat traffic in sensitive areas of the Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Information on the number of boats and expected usage of the inner firth should be provided.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>We have been consulted by the planning authority at the screening and scoping stage of this development. This proposal also links in to the Inverness West Link Road project and the proposed Sports Hub at Torvean. Our responses on previous consultations are still valid.</p> <p>Appraisal of the impacts of the proposal and advice</p> <p>River Moriston SAC</p> <p>This development brief straddles the River Ness, an important route for migrating Salmonids using the River Moriston Special Area of Conservation (SAC). There is potential</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>for water quality in the River Ness to impact the designated features of the River Moriston therefore we suggest some alterations to the 'Developer Requirements' listed in the development brief. We welcome the production of a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) but suggest the bullet point which mentions this is amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce a revised strategic Drainage Impact Assessment to enable the development of a strategic approach to sustainable drainage across Ness-side and to safeguard the water quality of the River Ness. <p>This makes the point slightly focussed and clearly states why the DIA is required. Whilst this addresses the issue of drainage there is no mention of a requirement for developers to produce a construction method statement. We would advise that production of a construction method statement would further help safeguard the water quality of the River Ness. We recommend the inclusion of an additional bullet point worded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality of River Ness to be protected during construction works (particularly at Ness-side) by production and approval of a Construction Method Statement to avoid pollution and sediment run-off <p>Moray Firth SAC</p> <p>Additional boat movements in the Moray Firth SAC could potentially affect the bottlenose dolphins through underwater noise and disturbance due to the presence of vessels. The Inner Moray Firth is well used by the dolphins and the locality is already exposed to relatively high levels of boat traffic. Further information on the likely number of additional vessels to access the sensitive waters of the inner Moray Firth should be provided. We do not consider this is likely to be an issue, but if the new marina is likely to result in a significant additional amount of time that vessels spend in the presence of dolphins then we would recommend various mitigation measures to be put in place. These will be based on the arrangements currently in place for the Inverness Marina Ltd where vessels agree to adhere to best practice in terms of how to behave in the presence of dolphins.</p> <p>Torvean Landforms SSSI</p> <p>The development brief includes proposals for a number of activities and uses in and around the SSSI, such as mountain biking, running trails etc. Increased activity and construction of trails and other infrastructure may impact on the designated site. The inclusion of an extra bullet point would protect the interest feature of the SSSI raising awareness of this potential issue. This bullet point could be worded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of any adverse effects on the adjacent Torvean Landforms Site of Special Scientific Interest. <p>Other Issues</p> <p>The existing green network within the development brief is important for both protected species and public access. It should be made clear that existing components of the green network within the area should be protected, with links made to them by new greenspace and walking elements within the development. The existing green network would allow for habitat corridors, results of the species survey (including badger and otter), and footpaths/cycleways. The bullet point which relates to this should be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding of existing green network features (people and wildlife), and linkage of greenspaces within the development to the green network both within the site and linking to the wider green network of adjacent sites, including the safeguard of land for the linear riverside greenspace to the west of the Link Road.
02061 D Shields	<p>The 'filling in' as it was described to me at the public consultation of the last undeveloped area of Inverness city is important in maintaining the feel of Inverness as it continues to grow. Consideration of this has been well met in the development brief and appears to look to the needs of the future rather than just the present. However, I have a few suggestions for possible alterations.</p> <p>Note: As a resident of the Holm area, my opinions are largely based on the development plan for the southern side of the river.</p> <p>1: The area around Holm Mills is not only full of character, but a popular tourist area, so maintaining the green feel to this part would be a consideration. I would suggest that a park in the style of Bellfield park, which is so popular and is a credit to Inverness should be created next to Dores road in this area. Development on the south side of the river has often forgotten green spaces (particularly when so much still exists on the north of the development plan), and I feel that a park like this would be of great benefit to all in the Holm and Ness-side area, providing a social and leisure area that is more than just a sports field.</p> <p>2: As this is still within the city boundary, the need to maintain the feel of the rest of the city and not merely pack in as many houses as the development companies can is crucial in not only supporting how Inverness wants to be perceived as a city, but also the 'village' feel of the Holm area for all its current residents. As a result of this the placing of some facilities other than housing is a positive step. I feel this could be increased with provision for cafes and other leisure areas, especially away from the Tesco</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>area.</p> <p>3: Inverness is and shall be at increased risk of flooding if current predictions of sea level rises are anywhere near accurate. The area to the west of the new proposed link road is not to be used for housing and could therefore be altered and lowered for use as an artificial flood plain, replacing the long-developed Carse. This would help to protect the centre of the city (which seems to be far more at risk than the Ness-side area), from potential flood events contributed to by the spring river spates by acting as a sponge. This could provide a long-term solution to this danger at a very inexpensive cost, negating the need for more expensive flood alleviation schemes and supporting those already in place. As a short river, there are limited areas where this can take place, and as seen with the Carse, once it has been developed, is cannot be reclaimed.</p> <p>4: More protection and a larger buffer around the river itself.</p> <p>Green areas are important within a city and as Inverness expands beyond all the original city boundaries, the need to maintain the 'Inverness City' feel of areas such as Ness-side will become more important, rather than turning this last un-developed area of the city into a glorified suburb. In this I feel the development brief has been largely successful and those who created it are to be congratulated. I would like to remind those who make these decisions however that Inverness is famed as a very green city and that should be taken into consideration, because when a green space is lost, it is lost forever. As a note on the public consultation event, I would like to mention a chap called Simon, who discussed with me in a very clear, precise and illustrative way how the development of this area of the city is planned. Keeping the mature trees is a welcome sight, though provision for maintaining this when some of them die off is also important.</p>
<p>02058 J Risby</p>	<p>What will happen to golf course? How will noise and pollution affect whin park?</p> <p>I would prefer the option straight across the river and canal.</p> <p>I think the proposals for ness-side development are uninspiring and I had hoped the Planners would come up with a more 21st century concept. The plans seem to focus on high density housing rather than sustainability and community green space. Could there not be allotments or larger gardens to help address this?</p>
<p>01958 R Newmark</p>	<p>Quoting verbatim from a HC Joint Report by the Directors of Planning & Development and Transport Environmental & Community Services:</p> <p>"The Highland Structure Plan, approved by Scottish Ministers, clarifies that the A96 Corridor is the agreed direction for growth of the City not the Great Glen. Members will recall the reasoning for their commitment to this approach. That is, the A96 Corridor provides easier to develop land, better integration with both existing and expected infrastructure investment towards the airport and has the backing of the Enterprise Network because the land is best places and connected to attract new jobs and drive the whole Highland economy forward. Conversely, allowing the city to expand further along the A82 to the south-west, would have greater environmental impact and only exacerbate locally generated traffic problems at existing and any proposed future canal crossings".</p> <p>Why have Councillors ignored this instruction and deliberately encouraged development in Charleston and Ness-side, contrary to this policy agreed in 2001.</p>
<p>02065 A Matheson</p>	<p>It is very important that access to the river is improved and enhanced with a path running the entire length of the development stretch of the river in the Ness-side plan. At present access rights do not enable people to walk through the field at Milton of Ness-side and access the river (though not many people do); this proposal would prevent that which is unacceptable. The proposed large houses should not have gardens right down to the river - space must be left for public access (not just fishing access) as well as a way for the public to get there. The Local Authority Access Officer should be asked for advice about access to the river, and the benefits of enhancing and improving current access, as well as the need to ensure that access rights (such as exist over the Milton of Ness-side field to the river) are not negatively affected.</p> <p>It is very important that cycle path be included particularly from the Holm roundabout down the Dores Road as far as the development area stretches, but ideally the whole length of the Ness-side development. There are many cyclists who use this stretch of road, and many who would like to but will only do so when a proper cycle lane is available. This would contribute to Scottish Government targets for increased cycle use for short journeys. Ideally the cycle lane will be separate from the road not just an added on bit at the side of the road - the latter type of cycle lane is not very good as people park in it, cars don't give cyclists enough room etc.</p>
<p>02066 Simon Varwell</p>	<p>The plans for development at Torvean and Ness-side are in principle a good idea - having more sports facilities in a relatively central location is great, as is opening up more land at Ness-side for housing and other facilities.</p> <p>However, the plans should not have Option 6 at their heart, because this road is counter-productive, environmentally destructive, and unpopular. ~Developers naturally want the maximum return for their land, but the Council should be beholden to this. In any case, a direct route through Ness-side from the Dores Road roundabout to Torvean is not a problem for housing in the Ness-side area, especially if an alternative crossing to the Council's expensive Option 7 was considered: such as a pillar- or tunnel based crossing.</p> <p>A Torvean crossing is perfectly compatible with maximum use of the land at Ness-side, and this should be the Council's objective.</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
00979 James Kidd	3. At the public exhibition of the project there were plans on display identifying a lagoon / marina on the existing golf course between the two swing bridges. This is purely pie in the sky window dressing to mislead the public by making the whole development look more attractive and desirable and compensate for the loss of such high amenity areas. Has it been costed and have Scottish Waterways included the project in their future Capital programme. If not the proposal should be removed from plans and public display as a meaningless frivolity.
02081 I Shields	At the consultation the plans were very clearly explained by Simon Hindson and he was able to answer all my questions, thank you. One further consideration would be to add more shops, restaurants or cafes to the west in Holm or Culduthel to give a centre to the community and encourage more people to visit this part of town.
02080 A Whitford	In 2001, I have been told that the Highland Structure Plan specifically stated that city expansion should be along the A96 corridor, and not up the Great Glen, and a number of sensible reasons were cited for this policy. None of these reasons have changed, so why has the present Council decided to ignore this advice by allowing development at Charleston/Ness-side, which will have all the detrimental effects that were listed in 2001.
00988 Cardrona Charitable Trust/Mr & Mrs Macdonald	Owners of land at Ness-side and Milton of Ness-side. Pleased to note that the Council is seeking to make progress with the preferred Option 6. In doing so it appears that comments we made previously on behalf of these clients in respect of visual impact and disturbance to the River Ness environment, notably the fishing interests, have been taken on board. The completion of the West Link will improve connections for several modes of transport (vehicles, bicycles, buses and on foot) across Inverness, relieve traffic congestion in the centre of the city. It will also open up development opportunities for healthcare related uses by charitable organisations, low density housing and expansion of greenspace at Ness-side Fields. It will also result in improved sports facilities on the west side of the city. Unfortunately, the delay in constructing the West Link to date has seen the interest in developing specialist healthcare uses for that land diminish over the years, which is a loss for the city. The link should have been completed 25 years ago to allow properly planned development across the whole of Inverness. We therefore now urge the Council to press on and conclude the necessary planning and environmental procedures to allow works to proceed as soon as possible.
02067 Rob Raynor	It's good to see that a significant area of green space will be retained in the SW of the area, however, there should be provision for public access along the whole affected length of the River Ness, including the river bank close to the larger houses at Milton of Ness-side. However, this path should not be lit as this is likely to restrict use of the riverbank at night by wildlife (otters, bats etc). Some of the fields in the development area are likely to be used by badgers and proper provision will be needed for them if this area proves to be an important foraging resource for them. A thorough badger survey will be required to identify all setts and foraging areas. Appropriate mitigation will be required to ensure that badgers are able to continue to utilise the area and, if necessary, provision of safe access under the new link road will be required if badgers are likely to attempt to cross it. The badger survey should inform the details of any mitigation that will be required.
01254 Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group	These comments are informed by our review of the Draft Development Brief, our attendance at the Design Charrette and subsequent discussions with your Planning and Roads Officers. It also follows on from our submissions on the Local Development Plan Main Issues Report. On behalf of our Client, we wish to support the identification of the Holm Mills Shopping Centre within the Draft Development Brief as an existing Tourism/Retail/Commerce use. We also welcome the acknowledgement and recognition at paragraph 5.27 that the Holm Mills Shopping Centre "is an important retail and tourism destination for the City". We are, however, disappointed that this major retail and tourist destination is not identified as an important existing facility within Map 2: Facilities and Movement Audit. The Holm Mills Shopping Centre is an important part of the existing retail offer and retail hierarchy within Inverness and a significant local visitor destination in its own right. It provides a very wide range of retail goods, including clothing, jewellery, food and whisky, household goods, music, books, DVDs, sports and golfing accessories, gifts and traditional Scottish foods. It is also the home of James Pringle Weavers and the Highland Life Weaving Exhibition and the Ghillies Restaurant. The Holm Mills Shopping Centre is a dedicated stop on the Inverness City Sightseeing Tour Bus Route and is visited by a significant number of private coach tours throughout the year. Visitor numbers to the Centre are significant. It is an important facility attracting a substantial level of transport movements on a daily basis. It is therefore disappointing that this has not been recognised within the Facilities and Movement Audit as set out in the Draft Development Brief. Of more significant concern to our Client is the lack of a direct vehicular access from the proposed new Link Road to this existing important local facility. As currently shown on Maps 5 and 9, the Holm Mills Shopping Centre is effectively "landlocked". This could seriously prejudice the future expansion of the Centre as set out in paragraph 5.27.

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>We would therefore request that the Development Brief, as shown in Map 9: Indicative Masterplan Ness-side, is amended to show a direct, and ransom-free access link from the Holm Mills Shopping Centre through to the proposed new road layout. This would mirror the situation provided for at the exiting retail centre to the south of the Ness-side area.</p> <p>This amendment would properly recognise the importance of the Holm Mills Shopping Centre and ensure that its proposed expansion and extension can be progressed to the benefit of the local and wider area.</p> <p>We trust this suggested amendment can be accommodated and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss and review this matter with the Council as part of the progression of the Development Brief.</p>
<p>01205 M De La Torre</p>	<p>Encourage traffic to use the new link road along the river to the Dores Holm Roundabout in preference to the shorter direct link to Dores Road. The design of the road and pavement is particularly narrow at the stretch Dores Road and Island Bank Road join, as well as a long Island Bank Road. This road is not designed to cope with the high level of traffic it suffers and in particular with the frequent heavy vehicles and buses, the situation will get worse with more housing.</p> <p>There is a lack of recreational facilities planned on the East side of the river. This will increase traffic flow across the river and the level of congestion will increase again. The area between Inverness and Dores (Torbreck woods, and south Loch Ness) has a very distinct character, and is a well-used area by cyclists, runners and walkers) and a prime tourist destination. It is extremely disappointing to see no plans are made to consider more strategically the future of this area. Again we see a lack of imagination where housing is driving the future use of this riverside area (opposite Ness-side). There is an opportunity to develop now a more strategic sets of non-vehicular route or routes that will connect Inverness to Dores, rather than limit plans to the road infrastructure.</p>
<p>00393 Tulloch Homes Ltd</p>	<p>PLAN ATTACHED</p> <p>1.0 INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Tulloch Homes Ltd (THL) are a key stakeholder in the development of Ness-side. They control the largest share of the site and the majority of the land over which the West Link is to be built south of the river. As such the content of the Brief is critical to protect their interests and for the future development of the area. The following represents specific comments and observations on the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief produced by the Council. These comments are accompanied by an alternative masterplan prepared for THL, using the principles established in the Council's Brief, and which we consider offers a more appropriate realistic alternative for development of the site.</p> <p>2.0 INTERNAL DISTRIBUTOR ROADS</p> <p>The internal road layout indicated in the Design Brief has changed from that shown on the Land Use Masterplan following the charrette consultation process in September 2012. The Brief now indicates 3 parallel roads: the West Link itself located closest to the river, and 2 internal distributor roads, that nearest to Dores Road accessing from the existing Tesco roundabout.</p> <p>THL question the use of the term 'distributor roads'. Our understanding is that The Scottish Government's Designing Streets Policy states that "reference should no longer be made to road hierarchies based on such terminology." We are also concerned that requirements for internal distributor roads will require compliance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and as such will require a greater land take to the detriment of the overall masterplanning of the site.</p> <p>The requirement for two distributor roads on the site is unnecessary and would, we suggest, not conform to the concept and philosophy for Designing Streets. The proposed materplan in the Development Brief would also lead to excessive cost and land take, with respect to the development of the site, taking into account land required for the West Link and central green space together with the proposed internal roads, one of which will also be used as a bus link.</p> <p>THL therefore suggest that as well as the potential access to THL land from the Tesco spur an additional road link option is incorporated, east/ west between the two main development areas, as indicated on the attached alternative masterplan. This road link, although not to 'distributor road' standards will by conforming to the principles of Designing Streets, provide a sensitive, permeable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian route linking both areas of the built up part of the site.</p> <p>This issue is discussed further under Green Wedge/ Central Corridor below. The additional access would allow options for increased movement across the site and improved connectivity, whilst still allowing for a large, meaningful open green lung through the middle of the site. Our concern is that by incorporating a large unconnected swathe of greenspace the community could become divided.</p> <p>3.0 GREEN WEDGE/ CENTRAL CORRIDOR OF OPEN SPACE</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>The location of the central green space is also a change from that proposed following the Charrette consultation where the main landscaped area within the site was located under the pylons, which cross the site in an east/ west direction. It is understood that the proposed layout has altered because Scottish Power are now permitting development closer to overhead power lines.</p> <p>Tulloch Homes are supportive of providing significant areas of greenspace within the development site but have some concerns regarding the large width of the proposed corridor and its potential future use. As noted above, in its current form it could cause a distinct division between both parts of the development area in terms of safety and anti-social issues, particularly if it contains significant tree planting/ landscaping. It may be more appropriate, whilst still retaining the green lane and paths north/ south, to provide linked pockets of parkland which could serve as more distinct focal points.</p> <p>4.0 INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY</p> <p>The Brief contains no information as to how major infrastructure works to service the site are to be provided. The Council's current conclusion is that SuDS and a pumping station may be located within the north eastern part of the masterplan area; this is land outwith Tulloch Homes control. It has also been suggested that the proposed SuDS etc. area will be used as part of the road construction requirements until the end of 2016.</p> <p>It is critical that alternative temporary solutions are identified so that early phases of residential development are not delayed until these facilities have been built.</p> <p>There are also issues regarding the funding of these and other major infrastructure works, which will benefit all the developers and landowners of the site.</p> <p>Tulloch Homes suggest that these are key issues which require speedy resolution with Scottish Water and other appropriate statutory bodies as well as Council departments to allow timeous planning application submissions and thereafter delivery.</p> <p>5.0 DENSITY, DESIGN AND OVERALL SCOPE</p> <p>Tulloch Homes welcome the Council's views on higher density housing for much of the site. As an edge of City site, Ness-side is in a thoroughly appropriate sustainable location to accommodate a significant number of houses. Tulloch Homes would also suggest that there is not a cap on housing numbers for the site but that the design, mix and appropriate landscaping for the whole area should inform final development figures.</p> <p>The alternative masterplan which accompanies these comments has been progressed using high standards of design, adherence to Designing Streets and contains meaningful areas of open space. The proposed revisions to the draft masterplan are derived from an initial study of the practicalities of delivering a viable development and take account of known constraints and concerns regarding titles and access requirements. It includes THC's initial indicative design proposals including proposed areas of higher density and landmark/ more prominent buildings at key junctions. It generates an indicative scope of 400-450 housing units on Tulloch Homes land holding. Tulloch Homes would support a full range and size of units across the site with as noted, higher density reflected along main road frontages and at focal points.</p> <p>Road network:</p> <p>The suggestion to remove the second spine road from the eastern boundary adjacent to Tesco would obviate the need to remodel Tesco's existing service yard and access along with relocation of the existing sub-station, both of which are in direct conflict with the line identified. In removing this section it would also help address the spirit of Designing Street's, where a proliferation of unnecessary hierarchical road networks is to be avoided. A through route which would utilise the development roads could still provide a suitable access that would have the effect of reducing speed along this route. In reviewing the points of access to the adjacent development parcel, it is noted that it may possible to access to the THL site via the existing adopted round-about tail at the entrance to the Tesco site (to the rear of the filling station), but it would be prudent to avoid any future constraints to accessibility by including an access off the remaining spine road proposed to the west of the green corridor. Whilst this would cross the green corridor, it is likely that a suitable form of road geometry and design could suggest pedestrian priority at the critical location and reduce perceived conflict. The resultant two access points which should both be available, would help ensure free traffic movement in the event of any unforeseen partial closure.</p> <p>The access indicated to serve the existing farm and the adjacent development parcels to the west and south of the SDR is intended to give priority to the larger site in recognition of the likely traffic flow. A secondary junction would service the northern development parcel with a junction off to serve the farm area. This would be in preference to a further roundabout, which has the effect of disorientation of the user.</p> <p>Access to the site west of the remaining spine road would be via a minimum of two points off the spine road.</p> <p>Density:</p> <p>The relative densities indicated within the council's draft masterplan are generally appropriate, but the suggested outcome numbers fall short of the likely outcome in achieving the massing suggested within the document. The key nodal points and frontages to the initial section of SDR can facilitate higher density development but an initial</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>feasibility study has indicated that a continuous wall of development may prove awkward to deliver, given the need to accommodate parking sensitively. It may be that a mixture of flats and townhouses would allow a more appropriate solution. Within the development parcels the general densities are acceptable and are representative of localised feasibility outcomes. However, overall density from the feasibility, which takes account of sufficient open space, access requirements and designing streets, remains higher than anticipated within the draft document. It is in the order of 400 to 450 units within the Tulloch controlled area. This is in part due to the balance of higher density frontage sought through the brief, and in part due to smaller house units being accommodated to address the current market trend. The smaller units have the effect of raising house number density while remaining fairly similar in bed-space density. To reduce numbers unnecessarily would dilute streetscapes and result in a more suburban style layout. It is therefore likely that a suitable solution addressing the affordable end of the market will raise the density in line with the suggested figures of 400 to 450 units.</p> <p>6.0 PHASING</p> <p>THC have confirmed that the phasing plan shown in the Design Brief should have included an area of THL landholding within phase 1 of the development. This approach is thoroughly supported in that Tulloch Homes are to date the only developer/ housebuilder for the site, own the land which critically forms the first part of the West Link and wish to commence development of the site as soon as possible. It is understood that planning applications can be submitted once the Council has agreed the legal commitment for the West Link to proceed, but that no houses could be occupied until the road link has crossed the river, currently programmed for December 2016. THL suggest that the Council gives consideration to the suggestion that development and occupation of residential units in Phase 1 could proceed in advance of the West Link as long as it doesn't prejudice delivery of the road. This approach would be supported by a Transport Assessment. There are still issues however regarding the building of the road and how this would accommodate construction of new residential development. The Council have suggested, and as noted above, that land would be needed for stock piles and designated access routes. Tulloch Homes have concerns therefore that the road will to all intents be a construction site until it is complete and open, again delaying any potential development. It is therefore suggested that development could commence from the Tesco spur road or a suitably agreed alternative as Phase 1. It is further suggested that the Council give full consideration to phasing the construction of the WLR so that development is not delayed and can take place after completion up until the first new roundabout, in effect a two phase process of Stage 1 of the new road. The Brief also needs to be clear and flexible concerning the timing of the phases of the development, in that not all areas of a certain phase have to be complete before future development of the next phase can begin.</p> <p>7.0 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS</p> <p>These are listed in the Brief and identified per housing unit. It is accepted that some requirements, for example affordable homes, are fixed. Indeed THL are the largest developer of affordable housing in the Highlands, with a track record of delivering approximately 100 units per year over many years. The Company has a strong working relationship with established RSLs in the Highland area. THL can work with both funded and unfunded affordable housing models and anticipate delivery of units at Ness-side using both approaches. It is anticipated that there would be early delivery of such units at Ness-side in the 1st Phase of the development to contribute to THC's current requirements. The Council must however maintain some flexibility with other developer contribution requirements. It is suggested that at this early stage in the masterplan process these contributions should be identified as indicative, and subject to negotiation, until the true costs of developing the site are known. There is also concern that the Brief suggests that these contributions could be increased at planning application stage and that the construction of the West Link has currently not been finally costed and is likely to increase. We would suggest that this latter scenario is usual during progression of road design, but is potentially a significant financial risk to future developers of the site. There is no certainty regarding likely future payments. It is also not clear how the cost of the road has been formulated. For example the base situation should not be included in the traffic calculation, i.e. new developments cannot be expected to pay for existing problems on the network. The calculation of traffic increase also does not seem to take account of people trips and measures required to encourage sustainable travel such as walking and cycling. Although the Development Brief discusses these principles together with Designing Streets, these elements appear not to have been taken into consideration in the developer contribution protocol. THL also have concerns that land and its associated value will be lost for the delivery of the West Link, a road which benefits the wider area and meets the Council's aspirations, as well as contributing fully to its construction cost- in effect a double contribution to the new West Link. It must be borne in mind that any developer contribution mechanism must comply with the 5 policy tests outlined in Circular 3/2012 'Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; • Serve a planning purpose, and where it is possible to identify infrastructure provision requirements in advance, should relate to development plans; • Relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence of the development or arising from the cumulative impact of development in the area; • Fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development; and

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>• Be reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>With regard to education contributions, it is not clear when and how these have been determined. There is as yet no indication as to when the Ness Castle development will provide a primary school which could have ramifications for developer contributions at Ness- side.</p> <p>Infrastructure delivery and associated costs is another concern which has been highlighted above. The Brief states that boundary land should be conveyed to the Council at nil cost for infrastructure/services to prevent ransoming and also for land required for provision of West Link and accommodation costs. It is not clear how this will be achieved.</p> <p>8.0 OTHER MATTERS</p> <p>It has been established that the water main shown on Map 3 crossing the site in a west/east direction is a 50mm asbestos pipe, as such it does not represent a constraint to development. Between the proposed Ness- side and Mill Lade roundabouts there is a specified 25m exclusion zone on the west side of the WLR in addition to a landscape corridor. This significantly reduces the area of developable land and therefore viability of this site. THL require clarification as to what development, if any, is permitted within this 25m exclusion zone, e.g. landscaping, garden ground, roads.</p>
02086 TEC Services	<p>Kilvean Crematorium and Cemetery is located in the south west corner of the Development Brief area but outside the boundary. It is estimated that the cemetery has future capacity for approximately 15 years of lair sales. In the next 5 years it will be necessary to identify additional capacity either as an extension to Kilvean or at a new location. Extension to the south is limited by the access road to the cemetery from the A82 and to the west the land is over steep and would require substantial earthworks for laying out burial lairs.</p> <p>The following comments explain how the golf course proposals in each layout option affect the Council's options for extending the cemetery at the Kilvean site.</p> <p>All the layouts presented affect flexibility for extension on the north and east side to some extent.</p> <p>Layout 1 encloses the boundary of the cemetery completely on its north and east sides with no possibility for extension on those sides.</p> <p>Layout 2 provides some opportunity for extension on the north side, however the ground becomes over steep to the north limiting how much area could be incorporated into cemetery. Access to the extension from the cemetery would require a strip of land to be reserved to avoid crossing the gardens of remembrance – see the green outlined area on the plan overleaf. The area is crossed by a low voltage power line which will limit capacity. This extension may provide an additional 10 years of capacity.</p> <p>The Base Layout partially restricts extension to the east while the whole of the north boundary is available although that would be restricted by the low voltage power line and the marshy ponding area and its outfall.</p>
02091 R Ardern	<p>Please would you leave a strip of land at Ness-side to permit future construction of a bridge over to Torvean SSSI and to the A82 for a future bypass road.</p> <p>This could be designed as an amenity/recreation strip for the future housing development planned on that land.</p> <p>It would need to be wide enough to cater for a rising embankment, preferably gradual but, I suppose, a more abrupt Skye Bridge style might be considered. We could certainly have an inspiring bridge design for this location.</p> <p>There would inevitably be some shadow effect from this embankment (if it were to be built) in the winter, but the important thing is to reserve the line for the future and make sure that new residents buying houses are made aware that the amenity/recreational strip might well, at some future date, become a road.</p> <p>What would be foolish would be to build houses there and have to knock them down again to provide a road line.</p>
00538 D Henderson	<p>The proposals are, in general, very acceptable, subject to the following detailed comments:</p> <p>Sheet 5 - the space between the river and the WLR skirting behind Ness-side should be made more of a linear park, with generous dimensions, good foot access, paths, and amenities.</p> <p>Page 10 - the sport and recreation facilities require much more focused attentions and closer consultation with the sports clubs. This applies to short term measures to cope with disruption, and the longer term possibility for creating a new sports hub at Kinmylies.</p>
02195 M Allan	<p>I feel that the density of houses in the area between the Mill Laide & Ness Side Roundabout is too much the area & will inevitably cause a great increase in traffic along the Dores Rd & in to town.</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
JD Robb	<p>My comments relate to Map 9 – Indicative Masterplan Ness Side. This shows a road linking Dores Road to the roundabout at the south end of proposed bridge over the river.</p> <p>The link road shows “non priority junctions” but there does not appear to be any definition of these. However I understand that they are intended to give priority to buses and emergency vehicles but from information gleaned at the public meeting it appears that this will only “control” the traffic travelling towards the east of the river.</p> <p>I have always considered that any link road at this location will encourage traffic from both sides of the river to use Island Bank Road as a shortcut to cross the river. It may not be such a shortcut with traffic travelling east to Upper Drummond, Hilton and Drakies but certainly it will create a “rat run” going towards the west. The difference is that Merlewood Brae is one way down to the river whereas going up is via Stratherrick Brae which doubles back. Island Bank Road is not “fit for purpose” at present and cannot possibly cope with additional traffic unless it is to the detriment of road safety and amenity. The carriageway is too narrow for vehicles: it is impossible to pass safely if there are cyclists around; virtually all the accesses to the houses are “blind”; and there is only one very narrow pavement. Undoubtedly, even without this link road, there is bound to be a significant increase in traffic on Island Bank Road as a result of the Ness-side and Ness Castle developments and therefore to further exacerbate the problem by encouraging communities further of the area is in my opinion contrary to sound planning and road traffic policy.</p> <p>I therefore suggest that this link road should be deleted from the plan but if it is essential for emergency vehicles then a proper “controlled” barrier should be installed for these vehicles only – it is not an excuse to say the barriers won’t work in adverse weather conditions as they work elsewhere in the country. If buses need a link then I suggest they are re-routed such that it will not encourage the rat run referred to above.</p> <p>The other proposal in the Indicative Masterplan that I have concerns over is that of the triangular shaped area of residential zoning proposed next to the Ness-side buildings. Given the importance of the river frontage I feel that the area lying between the Link Road and the river frontage should be retained as public open space. Although there is public open space at Whin Park on the other side of the river together with Queen’s Park and Bught Park there is virtually no public open space close to the east side of the river within the city boundaries. This is an opportunity to rectify that deficiency.</p>
Inverness Rowing Club	<p>To prepare this response, Inverness Rowing Club has consulted with club members and club representatives have met with representatives of Highland Rugby Football Club, Torvean Golf Club and sportscotland. Club officials have also attended the public exhibitions relating to this project and have had regular meetings with Highland Council officials, their consultants and related stakeholders associated with the project. We have restricted our response to deal specifically with the sporting aspects of the development brief as it directly impacts on the future of our clubs and as a rowing club we must ensure continuity and continued growth in the short and long term. In addition to this response from our club, a joint response has been submitted in conjunction with Torvean Golf Club and Highland Rugby Football Club.</p> <p>COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS AFFECTING INVERNESS ROWING CLUB</p> <p>Generally</p> <p>Club Officials have spent considerable time over the last few months in discussion and in meetings with officials from the Highland Council and their consultants regarding the draft designs for both Phases 1 and 2 of the Inverness West Link in an attempt to cause the least possible disruption in both the short and long term to the club’s ongoing activities both on and off the water of the Caledonian Canal. These discussions have also involved contributions from representatives and officials from Scottish Canals. Inverness Rowing Club, its present boathouse and pontoons, its road access and its interest in and use of the canal are given only minimum acknowledgement in the plans presented.</p> <p>We would prefer the high-level bridge option, but given the decision for Option 6, the double swing-bridge option, we would require the minimum possible compromise of:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The canal, in respect of its unobstructed length from Dochgarroch to Torvean which is used for major regatta events and 5Km national time trials, its width between banks and pontoons/jetties and its navigational/traffic safety; 2. The motor traffic access to the vicinity of the Rowing Club

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p data-bbox="309 137 1850 169">3. The tow-path from Muirton to the kennels on the west bank of the canal and from Muirton to Dochgarroch on the east/town bank of the canal.</p> <p data-bbox="257 204 761 236">Matters affecting the club's use of the canal</p> <p data-bbox="257 239 2094 303">The additional pontoons/jetties south of the new swing-bridge as indicated on provisional plans extend very close to the present Inverness Rowing Club boathouse. As these new jetties are intended for motor and sailing craft, they will be unsuitable for rowing boats, while the craft moored to them will restrict canal width. They should be kept as far from (north of) the boathouse as possible.</p> <p data-bbox="257 338 2094 437">The submerged lay-off indicated on the plans, just south of the new swing-bridge will restrict canal width and, combined with the boats moored to the new jetties opposite, may make it impossible to turn our longest boats in this part of the canal. This would have serious implications for rowing Eights and Fours on training sessions and at our Eights and Fours Head regattas.</p> <p data-bbox="257 440 2094 504">[Having turned around north of the boathouse, these boats land on the west side steps, facing south, into the prevailing wind. Turning would be compromised by the restricted length and width of the canal north of the club steps and pontoons.]</p> <p data-bbox="257 507 2094 606">There is a proposal for a marina. The access to this for motor and sailing boats will compromise the canal frontage usage by Inverness Rowing Club even more than the planned developments without the marina. Has consideration been given to the significant traffic hazards of boats emerging and entering the marina right next to our launching area ? Emerging boat traffic from the marina will pose a significant hazard for rowing boats and their crews.</p> <p data-bbox="257 609 2094 708">If plans for the marina are progressed, restrictions must be placed on the frequency of boats passing into and from the proposed marina – for health and safety reasons. For example, a proper timetabling of movements and controls should be put in place and circulated to avoid collision, injury to persons and damage to equipment which could arise by uncontrolled movements to and from the proposed marina.</p> <p data-bbox="257 711 1899 743">We need the maximum possible headroom under the new Phase 2 swing-bridge when it is closed, to allow rowing access to the canal north of the bridges.</p> <p data-bbox="257 746 2094 845">When large rowing events are held (normally twice a year between October and March), we would like confirmation that during construction and when completed, the Phase 2 swing bridge will be opened for approximately one and a half hours in two separate time slots during the day of the event to facilitate the present boat turning areas between the club's boathouse and the existing Tomnahurich Swing Bridge.</p> <p data-bbox="257 880 929 912">Matters affecting the club's use of the canal bank/tow path</p> <p data-bbox="257 916 2094 979">Inverness Rowing Club needs the use of the canal bank for access and for parking members' cars throughout the year and especially for visiting boat trailers and towing vehicles at national time trials, regattas and training camps. In years to come, don't forget the club will certainly grow => more members, more cars.</p> <p data-bbox="257 983 884 1015">The plans imply a loss of parking space along the towpath.</p> <p data-bbox="257 1018 2094 1082">Such parking as is indicated in the proposal for a marina is not exclusively for Inverness Rowing Club and our visitors and <i>may not be available when needed – especially during regattas when a large number of visiting crews and lots of vehicles towing long boat trailers require adequate parking areas ?</i></p> <p data-bbox="257 1085 2094 1149">The plans do not appear to reflect the amount of ground area needed for boat assembly, rigging, adjustment etc, additional to the area occupied by the trailers and towing vehicles.</p> <p data-bbox="257 1152 2049 1184">The plans need to allow for our maximum attendances of vehicles, boats and people and failure to do so will result in chaos along the canal and adjacent public highway.</p> <p data-bbox="257 1187 1966 1219">Long trailers and their towing vehicles require to be able to turn around in order to leave the venue after the events. Space needs to be allocated for this purpose.</p> <p data-bbox="257 1222 2094 1321">The tow path is used by rowing coaches, on both banks north of the bridge(s), the west bank as far as the kennels south of the boathouse and the east bank all the way to Dochgarroch. The path needs to be maintained in a condition suitable for a pedal bicycle, also for emergency vehicles. This is essential also on grounds of Health & Safety - particularly relevant for the supervision of novice crews and for visibility.</p> <p data-bbox="257 1324 1236 1356">Will there be interruption of the canal-side towpath at the entrance to the proposed marina ?</p> <p data-bbox="257 1391 616 1423">Matters affecting access roads</p> <p data-bbox="257 1426 2094 1458">Safe access to the canal and boathouse must be maintained at all times with due allowance for the length of vehicles and trailers, whatever road layout is finally constructed.</p> <p data-bbox="257 1461 2094 1493">The radius to corners of the proposed access route to rowing club premises as shown of the road design drawings is too tight and requires to be sweetened to accommodate</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>vehicles and long boat trailers.</p> <p>Matters affecting services The boathouse currently has mains water and this will need to continue. There is currently no mains electricity on site; this will need to be brought in. The boathouse currently uses septic tank drainage, which has proved satisfactory, to date. What are the plans for maintaining/introducing utility services?</p> <p>Matters affecting parking of vehicles and boat trailers Parking, estimated basic requirements – see details in Appendix 1 on page 7 It should be noted that when large rowing events take place, the club's occasional use of parking facilities for cars at the rugby club and the aquadome will be reduced significantly by the proposed new road layouts relating to the West Link. On the indicative masterplan, on pages 20 and 21, it shows reduced areas available for parking serving rowing club activities which is unacceptable. It also raises the worrying point of possible conflict with users of quayside areas alongside the proposed marina which must be avoided – ref page 13 of the masterplan. As unhindered pedestrian and vehicular access to parking areas, boathouse and launching facilities for club members is essential at all times, we are interested to hear what plans there are to maintain this access on a regular daily basis and also when large regatta events are held. Please note that at these such events, the significant number of vehicles and trailers (as noted above and in Appendix 1 on page 7) are expected to be present and need parking areas. Such arrangements should be accommodated and take into account if security fencing is proposed to be erected around the proposed marina facilities.</p> <p>Matters affecting launching boats from pontoons and steps Proposals for waterside/canal moorings/pontoons require to be harmonised on the Torvean Development Brief and the Inverness West Link Road Design Drawings – as they are currently 'out of kilter' with each other. For example, on the south side of the proposed new swing bridge two long pontoons are shown on the road drawings whilst there are five shorter pontoons shown on the Torvean Development Brief. There is also a similar discrepancy on the relative drawings showing the pontoons between the existing Tomnahurich Bridge and the proposed new swing bridge. On page 13 of the Torvean Development Brief where the proposed marina is shown, we totally disagree with the positioning of five new pontoons on the south side of the proposed new swing bridge. The access position of the proposed marina is far too close to the position of the two existing rowing club pontoons and requires to be located much closer to the proposed new swing bridge. The installation of any new pontoons in the vicinity of either swing bridge should include a section of approximately 10 metres long set closer to the water level to aid launching of rowing craft.</p> <p>CLUBHOUSE DEVELOPMENT AND TORVEAN SPORTS HUB In common with the aspirations of both Highland Rugby Football Club and Torvean Golf Club, Inverness Rowing Club's plans for creating increased boat storage, enhanced clubhouse and launching facilities have been frustrated for over ten years by the delay in deciding the route of a link road/bypass for Inverness. As we understand that it is unlikely that the proposed Torvean Sports Hub will be located close to the banks of the Caledonian Canal, Inverness Rowing Club has a number of options to consider for future development.</p> <p>These are listed as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extend our existing boathouse to provide improved changing and boat storage accommodation along with indoor training facilities, showering, catering and meeting room etc accommodation.

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>2. Construct a new canal side facility on the canal bank south of the new swing bridge incorporating similar accommodation. We support the project for the construction of the proposed Torvean Sports Hub and would be keen to learn what facilities are likely to be incorporated as part of the project. The use of a fitness suite, changing and meeting facilities on a regular basis would be of interest to the club. The use of these facilities plus social and parking facilities would also be of interest when we hold large regatta events throughout the year.</p> <p>CLUB AND ROWING DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Inverness Rowing Club is the <u>only</u> rowing facility in the Highlands as well as having <u>by far the best</u> rowing water in the country with the only 5km course for national time trials in Scotland. It is recognised as a prime development centre and national facility by the national governing body Scottish Rowing, and two of our members are currently members of the GB Rowing Team. This surely gives us priority status regarding preserving these assets for the future? We have to plan for future expansion in terms of more members, more boats, enhanced clubhouse and launching facilities, and even more boathouses (UHI and/or Inverness Schools Rowing Association ?). We should not jeopardise our valuable water facilities for future generations when there are no suitable alternatives available.</p> <p>Appendix 1 Parking, estimated basic requirements <u>Current daily and weekend requirements</u> Daily – up to 10 cars Weekend – up to 25 cars <u>At Head Races – current Regatta traffic:</u> Approx. 12 trailers (9m) + towing vehicle (5m) + spacing to park/unload (8m) = 262m Visiting regatta cars, vans etc: say 40, at 5m: = 200m Inverness RC members staffing the event: cars/vans 15 at 5m: = 75m Total, without allowing extra space between parked cars, = 537m.</p>
Bennet/Clunas	<p>At the outset, my clients are generally happy with the content of the draft Development Brief as it relates to their land and note with interest the section in the Brief which relates to ‘Development around Powerlines’, Paragraph 5.14. This is clearly a ‘sea-change’ in the approach taken to my clients’ land at the pre-draft brief public consultation stage and is very much welcomed.</p> <p>However, whilst agreeing that housing development close to the electricity sub-station located on the site would be inappropriate for residential amenity reasons, it is considered that a non-residential ‘mixed-use’ designation in visual amenity terms would be much better than ‘open storage use’ (for which there is no known identified additional need for in Inverness) and, potentially provide for a wider range of deliverable, appropriate land uses and greater flexibility. It is understood that such an approach would not conflict with National Grid guidance on such matters.</p> <p>In this regard, my clients would respectfully suggest that the ‘mixed-use’ designation in the draft Brief be extended beyond that which is currently proposed between Tesco, its service yard and the sub-station into the proposed ‘open storage area’. This will not only provide for a greater flexibility in delivering appropriate land uses, but also allow for a better physical transition between the sub-station and the proposed housing development beyond in both residential and visual amenity terms.</p> <p>My only other comments relate to that of ‘developer contributions’.</p> <p>It is my understanding on reading the draft Brief that my clients are expected to transfer land at nil value to the Highland Council in respect of those parts of their landholding which include strategic open space such as the riverside park, sports pitches and the West Link Road and also, pay a financial contribution per unit as per Table 4</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	<p>Developer Contributions articulated in Paragraph 6.4 of the draft Brief? Is this correct?</p> <p>If it is, it does not seem fair that with particular regard to the sports pitches element as detailed on the Indicative Masterplan, my clients are required to not only provide for a significant part of the land relative to most other landowners within the draft Brief area, (the exception being the landowner immediately adjoining to the north-east) but, are also expected to pay a financial contribution towards it. This does not seem fair and equitable within the context of a proper equalisation method for the whole site.</p> <p>Furthermore, under 'Assumptions' in Paragraph 6.4 of the draft Brief, it states that any uses other than housing will be required to make a proportionate contribution towards infrastructure based on a per house equivalent rate. Please confirm that this would apply to a community use such as a church taking direct access of the Dores Road and what the extent of contribution would be? You will be aware that there have been recent discussions with Council officers regarding such a use on my clients' land to the south-west of the sub-station.</p>
Cllr Graham Ross	If the road is to open up previously unavailable areas of the river(particularly ness side) then there is a need for parking and picnic areas to be created. If parking is not provided, then people will park in the residential areas creating a potential problem for residents.
Donald MacKenzie	I find the idea of a "linear park" pathetic. What it means is a slightly wide roadside ditch. It will soon be dotted with shopping trolleys and other roadside detritus.
Margie Elgar - Bond	Cycle path extension from Dores to town - excellent - New Road over Loch Ness - good. From Ness Roundabout we want the rurality to dominate - not a sense of intense suburbs as a tourism business rurality is our advantage and it starts from entering South Loch Ness at the Ness (Tesco Roundabout).
Edward AB Kelsey	After seeing the plans for the new bypass at the West Link "Option 6" I wanted to express my approval. I am delighted to see the new sports facilities and new housing which is also included in the plan. As someone looking to buy my new house in the near future this is exactly the sort of area I would like to live in. I also look forward to the improved journey times due to the by pass.
Alex and Anne MacDonald	I note a marina has appeared on the latest layout, about two years after I was suggesting that the Loch Ness cruisers should do their change over of cruising clients above the present canal bridge in a berth close to the tow path in the golf course thus greatly reducing the required bridge opening at peak traffic periods.
Ian and Gail MacDonald	<p>As discussed with Tim Stott, the development plan for Ness-Side shows a dotted green line indicating a foot path on our land running from the proposed roundabout at the bridge across to Pringles Mill.</p> <p>This path had not been discussed with us in advance of the plans being made public, something that we are very unhappy about. We already have a major problem on our farm with dog attacks on our livestock, and the fact that people will see a new path shown on the development brief will lead them to think it already exists on the route shown, this will lead to more dog walkers than ever. In addition to this, the path shows a route through F&R MacDonald Garage, which is a place of business and has locked gates outside hours, which people already climb across. From the point of view of security this is unacceptable, this problem will be exacerbated further by the new path shown on your development map.</p> <p><u>We should have been consulted on this map before it went out, and we wish for this path to be removed and when it goes on public display a note put on it that this was an error, stating clearly there is no path</u></p> <p>This is yet another example of Highland Council putting things in place without discussing it with us first, this is our farm and we should have a right to say what proposals are acceptable before the public see them. We have only recently found out that a core path was put on our farm without any prior consultation (legislation clearly states that landowners should be consulted over proposed core paths), when it is quite clear it is in the wrong place and should have been on the councils ground along the river edge,</p>

Source	Verbatim Comments
	not on a working farm with sheep!!! We would like this core path removed when the next review takes place, as it was added illegally
City of Inverness and Area Committee	<p data-bbox="259 220 1339 245">Below is an extract from the Minutes of the City of Inverness and Area Committee from 15th April 2013:</p> <p data-bbox="259 284 860 309">During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-</p> <ul data-bbox="300 319 2092 912" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="300 319 2092 379">• as already identified during the previous item, a further consultation event was required in a central location in order to allow attendance by those members of the public who were unable to travel to the two other consultation events which had already been planned; <li data-bbox="300 386 2092 446">• little damage would be done to open spaces through the new development in that the proposals would build upon and improve the existing areas surrounding the riverside and the canal area; <li data-bbox="300 453 943 478">• an extra Marina would be an added advantage for the City; <li data-bbox="300 485 1839 510">• in terms of future housing development, the opportunity to improve upon current design arrangements in liaison with developers was welcomed; <li data-bbox="300 517 1659 542">• the Charrettes had been very helpful and informative and positive feedback had been received from those who had taken part; <li data-bbox="300 549 2092 609">• the joint working between Officers from the Planning & Development and Transport, Environmental and Community Services had been excellent and was much appreciated; <li data-bbox="300 616 1615 641">• this was an exciting opportunity for Ness-side and could bring much needed additional investment into this part of the City; <li data-bbox="300 647 1339 673">• new housing design was much needed and would be warmly welcomed by residents in the area; <li data-bbox="300 679 1032 705">• there was also a need to look at future school provision in the area; <li data-bbox="300 711 2092 772">• careful consideration required to be given to pedestrian and cycle access in the Torvean area from the outset and also the sporting and leisure facilities on the basis of use by new residents moving into the new housing developments in the area; <li data-bbox="300 778 1525 804">• reference had been made to cycle tracks in the Tomnahurich Cemetery and these references should be removed; <li data-bbox="300 810 1547 836">• further clarification was required on the issue of development around power lines and how this would be progressed; <li data-bbox="300 842 1279 868">• an increase in the number of affordable homes for rent in the area would be welcomed; and <li data-bbox="300 874 1928 900">• the new proposals for the area would allow balanced and sustainable communities to be created and this could only be of benefit for the City as a whole.