

Agenda Item	6.11
Report No	PLN/099/22

HIGHLAND COUNCIL
HANDLING REPORT FOR CASES RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

Report Title: 22/03325/FUL: Mr and Mrs C. Paterson
Land 40M SW Of Migdale Hospital
Matheson Road
Bonar Bridge

Purpose/Executive Summary

Description: Erection of house
Ward: Ward 1 – North, West and Central Sutherland
Development category: Local development

Recommendation

The application is recommended for refusal as set out in section 11 of the report.

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 1.1 It is proposed to erect a single dwelling 32 metres south of Migdale House (former Migdale Hospital). The proposed dwelling is almost identical to the previously refused application 21/05814/FUL – the only noticeable difference is that current plans depict slightly taller dormer windows. It would comprise a roughly cruciform plan, with a total internal floor area of approximately 225 square metres. Its footprint would measure approximately 14 x 14.4 metres at its widest points, reaching a maximum roof ridge height of approximately 8 metres. A detached garage (5.5 x 6.8 metres; 4.7 metres high) would stand to the east of the proposed house. Both buildings would be finished externally with slate-effect concrete tiles, smooth off-white cement render, with anthracite grey doors/windows/fascia/soffits. Site boundary treatment would consist of a post and wire fence.
- 1.2 While the proposed dwelling's design remains the same, a smaller distance would separate the dwelling from its garage. Access arrangements have also been revised, sweeping to/from the north in order to better retain existing street trees – some banking of earth around the access point might be required in recognition of land gradients. The application site has been enlarged to accommodate this.
- 1.3 The application site benefits from existing gated agricultural access at its easternmost corner. A public sewer lies a short distance from the site's north-west corner.
- 1.4 Pre Application Consultation: none.
- 1.5 Supporting Information: air source heat pump specification brochure; supporting statement; design statement; further support letter from the applicants; private access checklist; site selection report.

The application site is located within Dornoch Firth National Scenic Area – while a supporting statement has been submitted, any proposal within a National Scenic Area is required to also submit a Design Statement which addresses how the proposal takes account of its National Scenic Area setting or contributes to its quality. The submitted supporting statement addresses issues of design but does not outline the extent to which the design of the proposed house has taken into account or been influenced by the special qualities of its National Scenic Area context.

- 1.6 Variations: none.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site measures 0.124 hectares and is roughly square in form. The site is formed of agricultural land and is characterised by a gentle southward slope towards the Kyle of Sutherland, located within Dornoch Firth National Scenic Area. The approximate position of the proposed dwelling appears to have undergone some recent clearance of topsoil. The proposed dwelling would be sited some 32 metres' from the nearest neighbouring dwelling, a property within the Migdale House redevelopment. Trees line Matheson Road, with several present along the application site's north-east side.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- | | | | |
|-----|------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 3.1 | 6 May 2022 | 21/05814/FUL, erection of house | Application Refused. |
|-----|------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|

Jun 2016	16/02037/FUL, erection of house land east of Swordale Farm	Approved.
May 2019	19/01557/FUL, erection of house land east of Swordale Farm	Approved.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4.1 Advertised: Northern Times, 'Unknown Neighbour' (14 Days)

Date Advertised: 19.08.2022

Representation deadline: 02.09.2022

Timeous representations: 11 letters of support from 11 households;
1 Community Council support representation;
5 objections from 5 households.

Late representations: 2 further responses from an original objector, seeking to respond to others' comments and providing historic photographic material.

4.2 Material considerations raised are summarised as follows:

- a) Positive response to the proposed design;
- b) Currently a lack of local suitable housing at an affordable price;
- c) The proposed development would not hinder continued operation of farmland - development would indeed bring site-specific benefits such as improved drainage and access, enhancing agricultural operations and reducing carbon emissions;
- d) There is already a significant level of delivered and approved development closeby;
- e) Sequential site selection has taken place, the application site is the only site not deemed "operationally unsuitable".

4.3 Creich Community Council has discussed the resubmission of this planning application and supports the revised application. It is its policy to support young working families moving into the area, especially when they are returning locals with continuing family connections in the area. In its view the reasons for refusal of the first application have been met.

4.4 All letters of representation are available for inspection via the Council's eplanning portal which can be accessed through the internet www.wam.highland.gov.uk/wam.

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 **Environmental Health Officer:** no objections. Informative and conditions regarding construction noise and plant/machinery/ventilation noise requested to be added to any permission granted.

5.2 **Historic Environment Team – Archaeology:** no objections. Application site lies within an area of archaeological potential. Requested that a watching brief condition is attached to any permission.

5.3 **Historic Environment Team – Conservation:** **objection** lodged. The proposed development is located opposite Migdale Hospital, a category B listed building. The hospital was designed to be dominant in the landscape and its current setting, with

no development to the front of its principal elevation has ensured that this relationship with the landscape is retained, both locally and also when viewed from further afield. A development in the location proposed - isolated from nearby housing - would adversely impact this important setting and diminish its landscape context. I would note that there are numerous opportunities in the immediate area in which to position a new house that would both respect the existing settlement pattern and preserve the setting of this important and prominent listed building.

The scale of the house is large, tall and bulky, which will emphasise its obtrusive and incongruous nature in this exposed and open location. The design of the building is relatively nondescript and lacking in architectural quality or local distinctiveness.

The site is also outwith the settlement development area which marks it as non-compliant with the CaSPlan; the whole point of this planning framework is not to have development scattered randomly across the landscape; this proposal, close to the village boundary, should be better sited to conform with the existing patterns and areas of development. The proposal will also be contributing to ribbon development (out the Matheson Road) which is contrary to every such policy and guidance within town & country planning.

The proposal is unwelcome and does not accord with Policy 57 of the HwLDP or national Scottish Historic Environment Policy. The proposal does not accord with Section 59(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (referred to in Section 37(3) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997) which states that In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, a planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The proposed development, located to the front of the listed building's principal elevation and visible in key views from and to the listed building will adversely affect its special architectural and historic character and setting and therefore does not satisfy this test. As such we object to the proposed development and would strongly advise the applicant to find an alternative site located well away from the principal elevation of the listed building.

- 5.4 **Scottish Water:** no objections. There is currently sufficient capacity in the Bonar Bridge Water Treatment Works to service the proposed development. There is currently sufficient capacity for a foul only connection in the Bonar Bridge Ardgay Waste Water Treatment works to service the proposed development. The development proposals impact on existing Scottish Water assets.

6. **DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICY**

The following policies are relevant to the assessment of the application

6.1 **Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (2012) Policies:**

- 28 - Sustainable Design
- 29 - Design Quality & Place-making
- 31 - Developer Contributions
- 36 - Development in the Wider Countryside
- 51 - Trees and Development
- 56 - Travel
- 57 - Natural, Built & Cultural Heritage

- 61 - Landscape
- 64 - Flood Risk
- 65 - Waste Water Treatment
- 66 - Surface Water Drainage

6.2 **Caithness and Sutherland Local Development Plan (CaSPlan) (2018) Policies:**

No site-specific policies, however the placemaking priorities for Bonar Bridge relevant to the application include “protect settlement setting” and “sensitive siting and design that respects the settlement's location partly within the Dornoch Firth National Scenic Area”.

The application site is located outside Bonar Bridge's Settlement Development Area.

7. **OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 **Highland Council Supplementary Planning Policy Guidance**

Access to Single Houses and Small Housing Developments (May 2011)

Developer Contributions (March 2013)

Flood Risk & Drainage Impact Assessment (Jan 2013)

Highland Historic Environment Strategy (Jan 2013)

Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments (May 2013)

Rural Housing (December 2021)

Standards for Archaeological Work (March 2012)

Sustainable Design Guide (Jan 2013)

Trees, Woodland and Development (Jan 2013)

7.2 **Scottish Government Planning Policy and Guidance**

Scottish Planning Policy (2014)

Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (Historic Environment Scotland, 2016)

8. **PLANNING APPRAISAL**

- 8.1 Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Determining Issues

- 8.2 This means that the application requires to be assessed against all policies of the Development Plan relevant to the application, all national and local policy guidance and all other material considerations relevant to the application.

Planning Considerations

- 8.3 The key considerations in this case are:

- a) compliance with the development plan, planning history and other planning policy
- b) Siting

- c) Amenity and Privacy
- d) Impact on adjacent built heritage
- e) Design and Materials
- f) Access and Parking
- g) Trees
- h) Flood Risk and Drainage
- i) any other material considerations.

Development plan/other planning policy; planning history

- 8.4 The site lies outside, but immediately adjacent to, the defined Settlement Development Area for Bonar Bridge. The purpose of Settlement Development Areas, which come under the provisions of Policy 34 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP), is to guide development, with areas within the SDA generally having a presumption in favour of development providing proposals satisfy the design for sustainability requirements of Policy 28, as well as any other relevant policies. This is because SDAs are identified as being the most appropriate location for development, including housing developments, due to their existing and planned infrastructure and better access to Council service provision. As such, areas within any SDA boundary remain the Council's preferred locations for further development.
- 8.5 Where development is proposed in a location outwith the SDA boundary, the proposal requires to be assessed in terms of the Wider Countryside, and therefore under the provisions of Policy 36 of the HwLDP. This outlines a range of criteria against which proposals will be assessed, including the extent to which they are acceptable in terms of siting and design; are sympathetic to existing patterns of development; are compatible with landscape character and capacity; avoid, where possible, the loss of locally important croft land; and, would address drainage constraints and can be adequately serviced. The policy is supplemented by the associated Rural Housing Supplementary Guidance (SG), which forms an integral part of the Development Plan. The SG states that applicants should adopt a sequential approach when identifying housing sites within the wider countryside. This approach includes examining opportunities for redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance and thereafter identifying any potential infilling or rounding off opportunities of existing housing groups. The application is considered in terms of its compliance with the above policy context later in this report.
- 8.6 A significant and material consideration in the assessment of this proposal is the recent refusal of the application for an almost identical house (ref 21/05814/FUL) and whether there have been any material changes in circumstances since then to warrant support of the development. No review was sought of this decision.

Siting

- 8.7 This proposal is not considered to accord with the Council's general policies as set out in HwLDP relating to Settlement Development Areas (Policy 34), Sustainable Design, Design Quality and Placemaking and Development in the Wider Countryside (Policies 28, 29 and 36) as well as the associated 'Rural Housing' supplementary guidance (2021). This is because the proposal is contrary to the Placemaking Priorities of Bonar Bridge's Settlement Development Area (Policy 34), which states that any development should incorporate sensitive siting and design that respects the settlement's location partly within the Dornoch Firth National

Scenic Area. This proposal however would lead to further expansion of uncoordinated linear development on the outskirts of the town. The proposed dwelling would moreover be sited in an isolated and elevated position, with little discernible relationship to existing development along Matheson Road.

- 8.8 'Rural Housing' requires a Site Selection Sequential Approach to be followed to support an existing or new rural business. A site selection report was submitted in response to a Regulation 24 request for further information. A portion of land at Swordale Park is within Bonar Bridge's Settlement Development Area, approximately 520 metres south-west of the application site which is owned by the applicant's family. In addition, as set out under section 3 there are two sites which have had the benefit of planning permission to the east of Swordale Farm. One of which (ref 16/02037/FUL) has lapsed whilst another to the south of it (ref 19/01557/FUL) has not. Both sites are within the area identified on the land ownership plan submitted with the application. Either one of these sites could be supported. Notwithstanding this there are also other sites within the applicants existing landholding for which support could be offered which would not give rise to the same concerns outlined.
- 8.9 The application site however remains the applicant's preferred location, not least to enable the proposed dwelling's occupants to assist in family farm operations – it is asserted that a dwelling within Bonar Bridge's Settlement Development Area would require greater car reliance in terms of accessing Swordale Farm. While reduction of private car use is encouraged, this does not override the siting concerns which have been set out. A Site Selection Report has been submitted, however it does not appear to have adopted a truly sequential approach as required by supplementary guidance as potential sites are located in a relatively dense area mostly south-east of the application site, a maximum of 100 metres' distance from Matheson Road – in other words, options within only a concentrated part of the available landholding appear to have been appraised. Furthermore, no Operational Need Assessments or similar information has been provided to demonstrate that the applicants' availability for farm operations is required. Neither would it be considered appropriate in this case to consider the proposed dwelling as housing to support an existing rural enterprise, as this might require it to be tied to a business not in the applicant's direct ownership or control. The adopted Rural Housing supplementary guidance does however state that in these circumstances if the Council considers a sequentially preferable site to be available, then any new application is unlikely to be supported. It is clear that such opportunities exist nearby elsewhere, which would be unlikely to exert an impact on the listed former Migdale Hospital buildings.
- 8.10 The applicants have drawn attention to a series of existing delivered planning consents in and around the former Migdale Hospital. 20/04719/PIP, which received 'in principle' permission to erect a dwelling to the west of the listed building in March 2021, has also been highlighted. This permission however would continue Matheson Road's linear development pattern while the proposed development would appear to sit in isolation in the countryside; it also maintains a stronger relationship to Bonar Bridge's Settlement Development Area boundary than the proposed development. The application considered here has however been determined on its own merits, in accordance with relevant adopted policies and guidance.
- 8.11 The application site lies within Dornoch Firth National Scenic Area, which is protected for its special qualities. Two such qualities are 'inhabited surrounds within a wilder backdrop of hills and moors' and 'a wide diversity of woodland cover'. The

former quality pertains to coastal farmland on which the proposed dwelling would be sited, while the latter quality is relevant as the proposed development is considered to affect several street trees – this matter is discussed in further detail below; the interplay of different configurations of trees in a mosaic-like landscape is highlighted, to which these street trees are considered to contribute positively.

- 8.12 The proposed development is not considered to be sympathetic to existing local development patterns, as the proposed dwelling would appear isolated in its landscape. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy 36. The adverse impacts with regard to siting are further exacerbated by the site's position relative to the former Migdale Hospital, a Category 'B' Listed Building, as discussed below.

Amenity and Privacy

- 8.13 The isolated location of the application site means that it would be likely to affect the privacy and amenity standards of Migdale House residents. An air source heat pump is proposed to abut the proposed dwelling's south-east elevation, well away from existing neighbours. In light of the position of the house and the separation distance it is not considered that it will adversely impact on the amenity of the residents of Migdale House.

Impact on adjacent built heritage

- 8.14 Policy 57 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan outlines support for proposed developments where it can be demonstrated that they would not compromise a natural environment, amenity or heritage resource. Policy 57 stresses that the proposed development's form and scale, as well as the setting of any asset, will be taken into account. In this instance the proposed dwelling lies 32 metres south of the building formerly known as Migdale Hospital. This building closed to patients in 2011 and first received planning permission for conversion to residential units in 2015; its redevelopment is ongoing. The former Migdale Hospital comprises a substantial 'H'-plan building and adjoining detached single-storey range. Historic Environment Scotland's list description reads as follows, noting especially its substantial south-west facade:

2-storey, 11-bay, SW symmetrical facade, extended H-plan; all harled with tooled ashlar margins. 2 gabled bays flank centre round-headed entrance bay, 2 outer bays advanced, linked under 1 gable and projecting to NE to form rear wings; large 3-light windows flank entrance in ground and 1st floors, 12-pane sashes elsewhere.

- 8.15 The application requires to be assessed against 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting' which states that factors to be considered in assessing the impact of a change on the setting of a historic asset or place include: whether key views to or from the historic asset or place are interrupted; whether the proposed change would dominate or detract in a way that affects our ability to understand and appreciate the historic asset; the visual impact of the proposed change relative to the scale of the historic asset or place and its setting; the visual impact of the proposed change relative to the current place of the historic asset in the landscape.
- 8.16 With regard to the above criteria the listed building is reasonably prominent from certain viewpoints in Ardgay, where it is slightly obscured by trees but is recognisable as a substantial building set apart from the core of Bonar Bridge's built development. Open farmland is situated to its south-west in front of its principal elevation, an uninterrupted gap of approximately 200 metres is present to its south-east, while screen trees create an illusion of an uninterrupted gap of

almost 100 metres to its north-west. The proposed dwelling would not present any legible relationship to Bonar Bridge's existing settlement but would instead appear isolated within an otherwise open field, detracting from a listed building's setting.

- 8.17 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' also states that factors to be considered in assessing the impact of a change on the setting of a historic asset or place include cumulative impacts: individual developments may not cause significant impacts on their own, but may do so when they are combined. This is considered to be the case in this instance: recent development (both permitted and delivered) abuts the listed building's north-east, south-west and north-west sides. The proposed development, sited in proximity to the listed building's southernmost corner, would impact both its south-western and south-eastern elevations and do much to convey the impression of an historic building, once isolated in the open countryside, having been enveloped by modern development.
- 8.18 To summarise, the proposed development would impact on the immediate setting of this Category B-listed building. The proposed development therefore neither complies with 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' guidance, nor relevant legislation pertaining to listed buildings.

Design and Materials

- 8.19 The proposed dwelling design consists of a cruciform plan with a detached garage, which assists to break up its substantial form. The house would possess a large roof to wall ratio with concrete-effect tiles which, in addition to the overall siting, would be unsuitable in proximity to a listed building, with natural slate tiles preferred. Extensive glazing has been applied to the proposed south-west elevation, presumably to take advantage of views across the Kyle of Sutherland. Large glazed gables on exposed or elevated sites will generally not be supported under the terms of the Rural Housing SG due to light pollution and their reflective nature across the landscape, which would be especially noticeable and therefore the proposed dwelling's impact on a listed building would not be limited to daylight hours. The proposed dwelling has a main roof pitch of 45° degrees which is considered to be acceptable, however it would have been preferred if smaller roof pitches (dormer windows, garage etc) had repeated this pitch angle in order to achieve a consistent appearance. Overall however, the proposed dwelling's substantial scale, height and generous glazing are not considered to be sensitive to their location given the position of the house relative to the former Migdale Hospital Category 'B' listed building and its setting.

Access and Parking

- 8.20 The proposed access point would be located directly opposite a single-storey listed range parallel to the main building's frontage, recently converted to private residential use and now known as 'East Gate'. 'Access to Single Houses' supplementary guidance document states that any new private access should not normally be situated within 90 metres of a road junction or within 30 metres of an existing property access. These distances are appropriate for most minor rural roads. The proposed access point would be sited approximately 15 metres from Migdale House's East Entrance. Visibility distances to 120 metres in either direction are achievable; this is considered to be acceptable and exceeds minimum adopted standards for a road where the prevailing assessed speed is around 30mph. Although with the parameters of current adopted guidance given the available sightlines and low level of traffic this does not raise wider concerns in this instance.

- 8.21 The submitted application form proposes three parking spaces – this exceeds adopted minimum requirements for a four-bedroomed house and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Trees

- 8.22 Policy 51 states that the acceptable developable area of a site is influenced by tree impact, and adequate separation distances will be required between established trees and any new development. The amenity of Matheson Road is enhanced by a series of trees along its southern side, therefore any tree harm would be difficult for the Planning Authority to support. The Planning Authority is satisfied that existing trees are accurately identified on submitted plans and that none of these trees are proposed to be felled. The application site's proposed access point and service bay would fit between existing trees without requiring their removal.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 8.23 SEPA's Flood Risk Management Map does not identify the application site to be at any risk of flooding. It is proposed to connect to the public sewer, located within the application site's red-line site boundary. This is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with HwLDP. Surface water would be addressed within the site by means of suitable surface water soakaways, marked on a submitted layout plan which is considered acceptable.

Other material considerations

- 8.24 There are no other material considerations.

Non-material considerations

- 8.25 Doubt has been expressed over the status of building warrants regarding adjacent Migdale House's redevelopment – this matter was investigated thoroughly during the determination of a preceding application and all relevant paperwork was found to be in order.
- 8.26 Concerns have been raised in relation to loss of views as a consequence of the proposed development from adjoining properties.
- 8.27 The provision of a house would be for the benefit of a local professional couple and allow them to stay in the area.

Developer Contributions

- 8.28 Policy 31 requires that, where developments create a need for new or improved public services, facilities or infrastructure, the developer makes a fair and reasonable contribution in cash or kind towards these additional costs or requirements. As there are no capacity constraints at either Bonar Bridge Primary School or Dornoch Academy, in accordance with Policy 31 no developer contributions would be required on determination of this application.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed development is considered to be contrary to adopted local and national policy and guidance, in that its siting would impact the setting of a listed building within a National Scenic Area to an unacceptable extent. It neither continues nor respects Bonar Bridge's settlement pattern, nor does it contribute to the stated placemaking priorities for Bonar Bridge as set out in CaSPlan. It is

disappointing given the extent of the available landholding and the availability of other sites that this application cannot be supported however we would encourage the applicant to consider a revised location.

- 9.2 All relevant matters have been taken into account when appraising this application. It is considered that the proposal does not accord with the principles and policies contained within the Development Plan and is unacceptable in terms of applicable material considerations.

10. IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Resource: Not applicable
10.2 Legal: Not applicable
10.3 Community (Equality, Poverty and Rural): Not applicable
10.4 Climate Change/Carbon Clever: Not applicable
10.5 Risk: Not applicable
10.6 Gaelic: Not applicable

11. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for refusal for the reasons set out below.

Reasons for Refusal

1.	The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, Policy 29 (Design Quality & Place-making) and Policy 36 (Development in the Wider Countryside) as its isolated siting would result in a significantly detrimental impact on the settlement pattern and Settlement Development Area boundary of Bonar Bridge.
2.	The proposal is contrary to Policy 57 (Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage) of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, in that it would impact the protected setting of a Category 'B' listed building.
3.	The proposal is contrary to Policy 61 (Landscape) of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and Scottish Planning Policy (2014)'s Section 212, in that it would impact the special qualities of the Dornoch Firth National Scenic Area e.g. inhabited surrounds within a wilder backdrop of hills and moors, and a wide diversity of woodland cover.

Signature: Dafydd Jones
Designation: Area Planning Manager – North
Author: Craig Simms
Background Papers: Documents referred to in report and in case file.
Relevant Plans: Plan 1 P892 - PL01 REV D (Location Plan)
Plan 2 P892 - PL02 REV D (Site Layout Plan)
Plan 3 P892 - PL03 REV B (Proposed Floor/Elevation Plan)

Plan 4 P892 - PL04 REV B (Proposed Garage Floor/Elevation Plan)
Plan 5 P892 - PL05 (Detailed Site Layout Plan)

Appendix – Letters of Representation

Objectors			
1	Mrs Katy Malone	4 Migdale House, Matheson Road, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AG	20/08/22
2	Mr John Robertson	5 Migdale House, Matheson Road, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AG	22/08/22
3	Mr Alan McCartney	East Gate, Migdale House, Matheson Road, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AG,	21/08/2022 09/09/2022 14/10/2022
4	Mrs Claire Holtey	1 Migdale Gardens, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AH	18/08/22
5	Mrs Alison Agnew	The Lodge, Matheson Road, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AG	22/08/22

Supporters			
6	Mrs Julia Routledge	Mid Fearn Cottage, Ardgay, IV24 3DL	26/08/22
7	Mrs Rosemary Ross Barnett	Mid Gledfield Croft, Ardgay, IV24 3BG	21/08/22
8	Miss Chloe Macdonald	Croit Lara, Rhinamain, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AS	22/08/22
9	Mrs Catherine Brown	Daisybank, Ardgay, IV24 3BG	21/08/22
10	Elaena Wells	Balblair House, Balblair, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AW	22/08/22

11	Mrs Patricia Bremner	Kincardine Hill, Kincardine, Ardgay, IV24 3DJ	25/08/22
12	Mr Philip Gurr	Ard Mor, Matheson Road, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AG	24/08/22
13	Messrs Watt	Swordale Farm, Bonar Bridge, IV24 3AP	25/08/22
14	Professor Colin MacFarlane	Swordale House, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AP	23/08/22
15	Mr Norman and Mrs Ruby MacDonald	Baleshare, Cherry Grove, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3ER	25/08/22
16	Mrs Stacie Brix	1 Rhinamain, Bonar Bridge, Ardgay, IV24 3AS	19/08/22

