

## Plan It Applecross CLUP - Consultation Summary Report

The following table provides a summary of the sixteen responses made to the Applecross Community Land Use Plan (CLUP) during the 4 week statutory consultation period from 3 May – 3 June (2019). Statutory stakeholders are identified directly in this table. All others are identified by unique numbers and if clarification of origin is required this request may be made to The Highland Council. All changes have the agreement of key stakeholders: The Applecross Community Company, Applecross Trust and The Highland Council.

| Item                  | Ind. ID                                | Theme                | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| <b>General Issues</b> |  |                      |               |   |   |  |
| 1                     | 4, 7, 8, 1, 9, 13, 14, 15,16, HES, SNH | Support for CLUP     |               | Broadly support proposals across plan, and the Aims and Vision, whole peninsula scope, infrastructure led approach, and principle of promoting land for community and privately led development so as to increase balanced access to land ownership on peninsula. |   |  |
| 2                     | 4, 7, 8, 9, 15                         | Housing provision    |               | Support for proposals for housing provision given existing demand from seasonal workers and long term residents.<br>Suggestion that x10 houses needed as soon as possible.  |   |  |
| 3                     | 8                                      | Rented accommodation |               | Concern that those who currently rent may be doing so unofficially and are not protected or safeguarded.  | Potential to include in Collaborative Housing Strategy mentioned in CLUP App1 (p49)<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Added the following text in a new bullet point 'Address any existing unregulated renting concerns that may restrict tenants' rights'.</b> |  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme                               | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 4    | 3       | Engagement                          |               | Concern that engagement process may have limited the ability of some groups in the community to influence the plan (e.g. older residents).  |                                   | Noted. CLUP was built upon an extensive and open/transparent charrette facilitated engagement process where opportunity was emphasized. This involved initial community surveying conducted in 2018 by the ACC (with 153 valid responses recorded), focused sessions with specific interest groups (e.g. Over 60s, Crofters), open workshop sessions, and a final consultation on the plan over the month of May. |
| 5    | 3       | Allocation                          |               | Concern that current issues associated with housing supply are more related to allocation of existing housing that are either holiday lets or long term empty, and that that should be the focus.   |                                   | There are limited existing rights to acquire under used assets. However, the ACC may wish to consider surveying underused assets on the peninsula.  |
| 6    | 8       | Affordable housing control Measures |               | Support for mechanisms which will help ensure affordability on the peninsula.   |                                   | Noted, and addressed in Appendix 1 of CLUP. To be taken forward by developers, ACC / Trust, and Highland Council.   |
| 7    | 2       | Accommodation monitoring            |               | Concerns that figures (34%) provided in the introductory section of CLUP by The Highland Council are not correctly measuring the existence of holiday homes in Applecross. Anecdotal figures suggest a figure closer to 50%, therefore recording coding methodology utilised by HC may not be accurate (16% error). Additionally, |                                   | Noted. Whilst the quoted figure of 50% may be true, the 2011 Census data figure quoted - 34% - is the only official data available at the local level. Current planning legislation (The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997) doesn't differentiate between mainstream  |

| Item | Ind. ID  | Theme                 | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|------|----------|-----------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
|      |          |                       |               | what monitoring is being undertaken by The HC to resolve the fragility of the exceptional number of holiday homes, even at 34%. Lastly, the lack of HC enforcement of existing policy around holiday homes and the planning of buildings under one use class and then using for something different appears to be exacerbating affordability. |   | use homes, holiday homes and second homes so local councils have no legal control over switches between the different types of occupation of standard houses. The Scottish Government is aware of the distortions to the housing market caused by high second / holiday / short term let demand. The Government is currently considering taxation, licensing and planning legislation changes to control these issues but, to date, none of these potential controls is available to local councils. If and when additional powers are available then monitoring and enforcement will be necessary. |
| 8    | 4, 1, 14 | Prioritisation        |               | In order to assure faith in CLUP, it could clearly outline priority development that may take place in near future. In addition, request to outline the timeframe of the CLUP.  | To provide delivery potential a list of the priority sites to be included in CLUP.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>New table added to Summary / Next Steps section to show priority of sites agreed by Applecross Trust and Applecross Community Company.</b> |   |
| 9    | 8, 1     | House design and size |               | Support for a diverse offering of house sizes and types to address need for 1-2 bedroom as well as 4-5 bedroom. Support also for cottage style housing  |   |   |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme              | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|------|---------|--------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
|      |         |                    |               | shown in detailed site analysis in CLUP, so as to assure flexibility.   |  |  |
| 10   | 7, 3    | Ownership          |               | Concern that the plan needs to be co-owned and its initiatives delivered by multiple vehicles, rather than a reliance on one organisation (ACC). Lack of representativeness that may be perceived if only one organisation takes ownership of the final plan. | Given the collaborative nature of the process that led to the CLUP and its joint funding, it may be helpful to formally share ownership, as a partnership between ACC and the Trust, and/or the Community Council, or have the Forum adopt the plan formally.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>That new wording inserted in the Foreword or Summary / Next Steps to this effect:</b><br><b>This plan has been developed by the ACC and Applecross Trust and is a community plan, to be shared and delivered by all members of the Applecross Community.</b> |  |
| 11   | 6       | Development impact |               | Concern that submissions and contributions taken during the charrette from newer members of the community may result in insensitive development which may damage existing environment, culture and community.   |  | CLUP makes clear the important natural, social and economic assets that Applecross has (as shown in Vision Section) and the need to protect this.                                      |
| 12   | 6       | Croft development  |               | Concern that development of crofts without testing existing supply, and without sufficient re-sale restrictions, will lead to an unintended increase in holiday lets and/or disused crofts.   |  | Planning application process will give an opportunity to those who wish to comment further on site specifics.<br><br>Mechanisms for the control of the resale of crofts may be covered |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme                                   | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|------|---------|---|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
|      |         |   |               |  |                                   | under crofting legislation or applied as a covenant to property by developer.  |
| 13   | 6       | Provision of house numbers              |               | Concern that increased housing supply will not be met with employment opportunities, and demand from those in need of accommodation (social rented & private). |                                   | <p>Planning application process will give an opportunity to those who wish to comment further on site specifics.</p> <p>Demand for social rented accommodation has been demonstrated in the CLUP through use of Highland Council needs assessment, and prior community surveying.</p> <p>CLUP Place Making Principles establish a clear preference for a sustainable Applecross where housing and employment are created alongside each other.</p> <p>Mechanisms for the control of the resale of crofts may be applied as covenant to property by developer. (Appendix 1)</p> |
| 14   | 6       | Unintended development of holiday homes |               | Concern that any new housing will eventually end up as holiday lets.   |                                   | <p>Noted. This may be controlled through conditions applied at the Highland Council planning application process.</p> <p>Mechanisms for the control of the resale of crofts may be applied as covenant to property by developer. (Appendix 1)</p>  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme  | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|------|---------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| 15   | 6       | Retail over supply                             |               | Concern that any new retail will conflict with existing offering.  |   | Noted. It is recommended that long term viability concerns are raised with the developer directly and through planning application process.  |
| 16   | 6       | Road investment                                |               | Investment required in roads in and around the peninsula (potholes and passing places).  |   | CLUP addresses issue in Appendix 1 (p.51).   |
| 17   | 4       | Local economy                                  |               | Need to develop a local laundry service centre/facility to address hospitality needs.  | <b>Change:<br/>To be included in Appendix 1, see Item 97.</b>   |  |
| 18   | 4       | Holiday home income                            |               | Need to retain holiday home income locally, by capturing any commission.   |   | CLUP addresses issue in Appendix 1 (p. 50).  |
| 19   | 4       | Waste  |               | Need for a central waste service centre to address recycling needs and inefficiency in existing waste being regularly taken away by HC.  |   | CLUP addresses issue in Appendix 1 (p.54).   |
| 20   | 7       | Derelict properties and historical settlements |               | Concern that re-settlement of existing villages and derelict properties is not promoted as highly as it could be in CLUP, and that growth need not mean changing the character of a place. |   | Noted. Certain sites are brought forward for re-settlement and are either not supported by existing landowners, or will not meet planning policy (e.g. proximity to services). CLUP does not however restrict individuals from re-developing derelict sites privately. |
| 21   | 8       | New school                                     |               | Propose that school and education facilities be a focus for any future service provision in the area.  | As a key service, education facilities to be included in priorities.<br><b>Change:<br/>Include new bullet point in Placemaking Priorities (p. 7) on school provision.</b> |  |
| 22   | 1       | Tele-communications                            |               | Would telecommunication focus local provision, i.e. Applenet.  |   | Yes, telecommunications to include all existing services.  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme           | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|-----------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| 23   | 1       | Community hall  |               | Community hall enhancement to include gallery/cultural space, more car parking, and a potential taxi service.  | Acceptable to include given the proposals found in Appendix are guidance only.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Include proposed additional enhancements in Appendix 1 item on Community Hall (p54): Gallery/cultural space, additional car parking, potential taxi service to Shore St.</b>   |  |
| 24   | SNH     | Car parks       |               | Concern that car park proposal in Appendix does not take into account caravan/campervan waste facilities.  | <b>Change:</b><br><b>Adding the following text after 'Dedicated campervan car park needed': "Consideration to be given to campervan facilities to address waste water and rubbish needs."</b>   |  |
| 25   | SEPA    | Status of sites |               | Concern that not all sites identified as 'Preferred' have enough viability detail to meet Scottish Planning Policy and Local Development Plan (LDP) Policy requirements, and that a brief outline be provided for all preferred sites that have not been analysed in detail. | Clarity on the issues associated with each identified site's planning status.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>All sites to be defined as 'Potential' and text to be added to Place section to show that a full planning application will be required for any development shown in this Land Use Plan. It is at this point that full site assessment will be required, i.e. flood risk, heritage and environmental impact.</b> |  |
| 26   | 9       | Layout          |               | The 'mock-up' sketches should all be removed from the plan as they are too speculative to be relevant to the   | The sketches provide a useful illustration of what could happen given development principles.   | .  |

| Item            | Ind. ID | Theme                     | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|-----------------|---------|---------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
|                 |         |                           |               | council's planning 'supplementary guidance'.  | However the fact that they are merely one approach, of potentially many, to design and layout could be better communicated.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Text added to all key site analysis pages to state that illustrations are merely indicative. Remove some illustrations.</b> |   |
| 27              | HES     | Heritage impact           |               | Concern that development in CLUP may impact on Cat B and C listed buildings. Need for HC's conservation advisers to inform proposals. Last survey conducted was in 1980s and conservation advisers need to be consulted on whether any ancillary buildings in the historic groupings are listed by curtilage. Recommendation that any development take into account the recently published new Managing Change Guidance Note on this subject - <u>Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Use and Adaptation of Listed Buildings</u> . |   | Noted. Planning application process to be used to address heritage related impact.  |
| <b>Strategy</b> |         |                           |               |   |   |   |
| 28              | 7       | Growth strategy for North |               | Opposition to the preference for limited growth in the North of Applecross.   |   | Noted. Workshops, and follow up event, evidenced a preference for less growth in the north given its existing low density and poorer service provision. CLUP does not restrict individuals from re-developing derelict sites if they wish to. |



| Item                                    | Ind. ID | Theme                     | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|---|---------|---------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| 29                                      | 7       | Growth strategy for South |               | Traffic concerns associated with any development in the South.  |   | Noted. Traffic and other impact associated with development to be addressed at planning application stage.  |
| 30                                      | 8       | Active travel             |               | Propose that active travel facilities should be promoted/developed south of Applecross Bay.   |   | Noted. Potential site for this at 2P Q R, as noted on map and in site analysis.   |
| 31                                      | 1       | Placemaking principles    |               | Concern that wording is misleading where the term 'make land available' is used.  |   | Noted. Land owners have been consulted throughout the development of the CLUP and any land identified will be shown on the basis that the landowner is content. |
| 32                                      | SNH     | Placemaking principles    |               | Concern that safeguarding of nature conservation, landscape and woodland interests are not represented under Environment heading.                 | Acceptable request given that areas outlined are not currently accounted for in Placemaking Principles and will align with sustainable development approach being taken.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Adding the following bullet point to Environment on page 7:</b><br><b>“Safeguard areas noted as being important for nature conservation, landscape and woodland interests”</b> |   |
| <b>Peninsula Wide &amp; Non-Spatial</b> |         |                           |               |   |   |   |
| 33                                      | 4, 14   | Electric bikes            |               | Support for electric bikes to ease congestion, and establishment of a locally run business focused on bike hire, utilising hubs outlined in CLUP. |   | Noted. Proposal shown in Appendix 1 (p.52).   |
| 34                                      | 4       | Infrastructure            |               | Need for 3 phase, telecommunications. Lack of these is  | Infrastructure is not covered in the Peninsula Wide proposals under Place (Pg 8).   |   |

| Item                    | Ind. ID | Theme        | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|-------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|--|---|--|
|                         |         |              |               | hindering development, especially power.   | <b>Change:</b><br><b>Two new bullet points be inserted</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>3 phase power to be provisioned in key development areas.</b></li> <li>- <b>Telecommunications infrastructure to be provisioned in key development areas.</b></li> </ul> |  |
| 35                      | 1       | Electric bus |               | Support for electric bus services and improved services to outlying communities, which will lead to improved self-reliance.  |   | Noted. Text shown in Place (p8).   |
| <b>North Applecross</b> |         |              |               |  |   |  |
| 36                      | 14      | Site issue   | 1A            | This should be a priority and further investigation required.  |   |  |
| 37                      | 1, 15   | Site issue   | 1B            | Concern that site may not be sustainable given its distance from main settlement, and that it may go into private ownership/holiday letting if no re-sale restrictions are placed on it. |   | It is recommended that long term viability concerns are raised with the developer directly and through planning application process. |
| 38                      | 8, 14   | Site issue   | 1B            | Support for woodland crofting in light of a growing demand for less mechanised and mass produced food sources. Further investigation needed.   |   |  |
| 39                      | 3       | Site issue   | 1B            | Site does not appear to be under the catchment area for Applecross Primary or Community Council and on this basis should it be handed to Sheildaig.                                      | Site situated within Sheildaig CC area, however still within Applecross Trust ownership.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>New text added to 1B Arrina Key Site analysis to state that if development brought forth Sheildaig CC to be consulted.</b>                                     |  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| 40   | SEPA    | Site issue | 1B            | The proposed layout results in a concentration of development near the watercourse and mention is made in the text to ephemeral channels where water flows during times of heavy rain and any overland flow paths. | <b>Change:</b><br><b>The Design and Form section updated to include: “The final locations of buildings and the access road will have to be shown to avoid flood risk, including from ephemeral channel and overland flow paths, and include a buffer of at least 6 m between the tops of the banks of the watercourse and built development. Watercourse crossings should be traditional style bridges.”</b> |   |
| 41   | 1, 14   | Site issue | 1F            | Supportive of proposal to reuse derelict property, particularly where traditional materials are used in modern design.   |  |   |
| 42   | 2       | Site issue | 1G            | Objection to the proposal of housing in Salacher due to water shortages.   |  | Noted. Planning application process to be used to address any potential water supply/access issues.   |
| 43   | SEPA    |            | 1H            | This is a preferred site which is currently not supported by any developer requirements.   |  | Noted, and if inclusion of this potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then the finalised developer requirements should include: “Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development.” |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 44   | SEPA    | Site issue | 1I            | If inclusion of this potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status then appropriate flood risk issues to be addressed. |                                   | Noted, and if inclusion of this potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>"Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development."</i> |
| 45   | 2       | Site issue | 1F            | Objection to the proposal of housing due to water shortages.   |                                   | Noted. Planning application process to be used to address any potential water supply/access issues   |
| 46   | SEPA    | Site issue | 1J            | This is a preferred site which is currently not supported by any developer requirements.   |                                   | Noted, and if inclusion of this preferred site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>"Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development."</i> |
| 47   | SEPA    | Site issue | 1K            | This is a preferred site which is currently not supported by any developer requirements.   |                                   | Noted, and if inclusion of this preferred site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>"Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed</i>  |

| Item                       | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|----------------------------|---------|------------|---------------|---|--|---|
|                            |         |            |               |   |  | <i>between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development."</i> |
| <b>Shore St and Estate</b> |         |            |               |   |  |   |
| 48                         | SEPA    | Site issue | 2A B          | Site analysis does not include flood risk mitigation.   | The Design and Form section should be updated to include: <i>"The houses should be located away from watercourses to avoid the need to assess potential flood risk."</i>   |   |
| 49                         | 14      | Site issue | 2A B          | Less support for this if housing can be provisioned through 2 H I J site (Clachan).   |  | Noted.  |
| 50                         | SEPA    | Site issue | 2C D E        | Site is within SEPA flood map for river flooding which would restrict the development of any new dwellings, but not the continued use of existing buildings.                                  | To ensure any proposed use of site will accord with flood risk requirements, any site analysis should address flood risk.<br><b>Change</b><br><b>Text inserted into the site analysis: 'This site will require a full flood risk assessment prior to any planning application proposal due to its location within a flood risk area. Thereafter, areas liable to flood risk will be excluded from the final proposal.'</b> |   |
| 51                         | 14, 15  | Site issue | 2C D E        | Support and commitment to the renewal of existing buildings and their conversion as flats or offices. Any expansion or new development outwith existing dwellings to be considered long term. | As per landowner's request, development to state that renewal of existing buildings be prioritised.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Key Site analysis to show that renewal of existing dwellings will be the priority, with new</b>  | Noted.  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|--|--|--|
|      |         |            |               |  | <b>construction occurring in a secondary phase.</b>  |  |
| 52   | 14      | Site issue | 2F            | Less support for this if housing can be provisioned through 2 H I J site (Clachan).  |  | Noted.   |
| 53   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2F            | There are a number of small watercourses and drainage channels within the site and 'Poor ground conditions' are outlined in the Description. | Key Site Analysis to show flood risk.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>The Design and Form section updated to include “Houses should avoid areas of poor ground condition and being located near watercourses to avoid the need to assess potential flood risk.”</b>  |  |
| 54   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2H I J        | The Potential Development Layout for Option A on page 29 shows the new carpark, road and visitors attraction on top of a watercourse.        | Key Site Analysis to show flood risk.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Layout plans removed and text to be revised to state that: “The final location of the building will have to be shown to avoid flood risk and include a buffer of at least 6 m between the top of the banks of the watercourse and built development. Watercourse crossings should be traditional style bridges.”</b> |  |
| 55   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2H I J        | The potential development layout for Option B on page 30 shows affordable housing plots very close to the watercourse.                       | Key Site Analysis to show flood risk.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Layout plans to be removed and text to be updated to include “A flood risk assessment will be</b>  |  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|--|--|---|
|      |         |            |               |  | <i>required for any houses located near the small watercourse to demonstrate they are not at risk of flooding. A buffer of at least 6 m between the top of the banks of the watercourse and built development. Watercourse crossings should be traditional style bridges.”</i> |   |
| 56   | HES     | Site issue | 2H I J        | Concern that design appears to depict a potential development area crossing into the scheduled area of the Applecross Monastic Settlement (SM2802) and in the vicinity of the B listed Old Parish Church (LB456) and Manse (LB 457), with indicative housing immediately to the north. This raises the potential for direct impacts on the scheduled area and for impacts on the monastery’s setting, particularly detracting from the character of the surrounding area and the potential to form a backdrop to views of the site from the south and elsewhere. | Key Site Analysis to show heritage impact.<br><b>Change:</b><br>That “views” and heritage impact referred to above in Item 54 should be built into the site analysis.  |   |
| 57   | 5       | Site issue | 2 H I J       | Support for the continuation of the use of the Heritage Centre in its current location, given its proximity to Christian artefacts and heritage.   |  | Noted, community support appears to show continuation of heritage amenity in Clachan area, and enhancement of existing community facility in Miltown. |
| 58   | 8, 1    | Site issue | 2 H I J       | Support for use as a visitor attraction, particularly if housing can be delivered elsewhere.   |  | Noted.  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| 59   | 14      | Site issue | 2H I J        | Support for housing/mixed use at site, with continuation of heritage centre as visitor attraction. Well linked to existing path networks, road, etc.  |  | Noted.   |
| 60   | 8       | Site issue | 2 H I J       | It may be worth considering whether additional parking to that indicated, i.e. overspill parking, could be beneficial to the intended use and community, e.g. a large flat drained area for other uses (e.g. bike safety classes, etc). | Additional parking at site could be of benefit both to meet existing need and could benefit community through additional uses.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Insert wording 'Additional overspill parking may be considered where it will not impact on site'.</b>             |  |
| 61   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2K            | Within a flood risk area, but not an issue provided overnight campervan parking will not be specifically encouraged.  |  | Noted.   |
| 62   | 1       | Site issue | 2L M          | Supportive of Sawmill development, and preference for prioritisation of temporary housing.  |  | Noted.   |
| 63   | 14      | Site issue | 2L M          | Not supportive of this if housing can be provisioned through 2 H I J site (Clachan).  |  | Noted.   |
| 64   | 14      | Site issue | 2O            | Support for improvements of Arboretum track.  |  | Noted.   |
| 65   | 1       | Site issue | 2P Q R        | Concern with conflicting proposed uses of public toilet/campervan waste disposal and housing.   | Clarification needed where use types may conflict. Highland Council advice given that the provision of a public toilet/campervan waste point would not preclude any housing or commercial development, however some restriction on the hours of service may be required. |  |



| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|---|---|--|
|      |         |            |               |   | <b>Change:</b><br>Wording added to Shore St Carpark Key Site analysis to show that use types may not conflict but would need to be managed appropriately.   |  |
| 66   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2P<br>Q R     | Parts of the site are at risk of coastal flooding and there is an adjacent small watercourse. Any proposals for new residential or overnight accommodation will need to avoid flood risk.                             | Key Site Analysis to show flood risk.<br><b>Change:</b><br>The Use and Development Type section should be expanded to include <i>“Proposals for housing or other overnight accommodation will need to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates the proposals avoid flood risk.”</i>         |  |
| 67   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2T U          | Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated, only if it is demonstrated that the steading is not at risk of flooding will it be suitable for housing or other types of overnight accommodation. | Key Site Analysis to show flood risk.<br><b>Change</b><br>The Use and Development Type section should be expanded to include <i>“Proposals for housing or other overnight accommodation will need to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates the building is not at risk of flooding.”</i> |  |
| 68   | 14, 15  | Site issue | 2T U          | Commitment and support for re-development of Steading site, incorporating ideas brought forward in engagement process.  |   | Noted.   |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|------|---------|------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| 69   | 14      | Site issue | 2V            | Support for the development of site for housing, at small scale (3-4 units). Proximity to local energy supply and existing village facilities make this proposal more viable.   |  | Noted.   |
| 70   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2Y            | If inclusion of this potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then appropriate flood risk issues to be addressed.   |  | Noted, and if inclusion of this Potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>“Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development.”</i> |
| 71   | SEPA    | Site issue | 2Z<br>AA      | Flood risk not addressed sufficiently in analysis.  | Clarity on flood impact needed.<br><b>Change</b><br>The following text inserted: <i>“For Phase 1, flood risk from the small watercourse will need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development.”</i> |  |
| 72   | 14      | Site issue | 2Z<br>AA      | Concern with proposed use as housing as intention was to re-plant as native woodland. Concern also with impact it may have on unrecorded archaeological features, and the viability of the proposal given topography, ground conditions, etc. | Clarity on site features needed.<br><b>Change</b><br><b>‘Description’ within site analysis now include ‘possible unrecorded archaeological features.’</b>  | Noted.   |

| Item | Ind. ID   | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|-----------|------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| 73   | 8         | Site issue | 2AC           | Must ensure cycle provision is accounted for in proposed path improvements.  |   | CLUP addresses issue in Appendix 1 (p.50).                                 |
| 74   | 1         | Site issue | 2AC           | Not supportive of the destruction of sheds and informal buildings where path is proposed. Suggestion that this will affect the amenity of land owners for benefit of tourists. | To avoid loss of existing structures along seaward side of Shore St, a potential solution to the path route would be to clearly mark out a footpath from the Applecross Inn to the cattle grid on Shore St, at which point a dedicated path would be formed, leading to Miltown. Demarcated path to include signage and lighting.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Include text on a newly demarcated footpath along Shore St (from Applecross Inn to the end of Shore St), and lighting/signage, leading to a new dedicated footpath to Miltown</b> |  |
| 75   | 3, 14, 15 | Site issue | 2AC           | Supportive of path from Applecross Inn to Miltown and the re-use of land on coastal side of road for path for public/community good. Seen as an overdue project.               |   | Noted.   |
| 76   | 14        | Site issue | 2AF           | Preference for site to remain under the ownership and management of Trust, guided by the Applecross Landscape Partnership Scheme (ALPS).                                       |   | Noted.   |
| 77   | 14        | Site issue | 2AG           | Support for proposal, with discussion already underway.  |   |  |

| Item                    | Ind. ID | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|-------------------------|---------|------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| 78                      | 6       | Site issue | 2AH           | Concern that swimming pool will be unfeasible due to long term maintenance ownership.   |   | Noted. It is recommended that long term viability concerns are raised with the developer directly and through the planning application process.   |
| 79                      | SEPA    | Site issue | 2AI           | If inclusion of this potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then appropriate flood risk issues to be addressed. |   | Noted, and if planning status awarded then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>“Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development.”</i> |
| 80                      | 3       | Site issue | 2AF<br>2AG    | Not supportive of natural hazel woodlands going to community ownership where Trust could meet objectives on behalf of community.  | Following discussion with landowner, the proposal of a community woodland to be altered to co-managed.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Site 2AF on Estate/Shore St Map altered to show ‘Co-Managed Woodland’.</b> |   |
| <b>South Applecross</b> |         |            |               |   |   |   |
| 81                      | 6       | Site issue | 3A            | Helipad better sited at Toscaig Pier.   |   | Use of pier as helicopter pad will prejudice any future development as strategic marine hub. Identified site has been considered due to its proximity to village and Bealach na Ba access road.   |
| 82                      | 14      | Site issue | 3A            | Support for proposal for helipad, and the need to work together to find appropriate site.   |   |   |

| Item | Ind. ID  | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue   |
|------|----------|------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| 83   | 14, 15   | Site issue | 3C<br>D       | Support for expansion of existing Community hall, and its continued use as the preferred site for community uses.                |  |  |
| 84   | SEPA     | Site issue | 3E            | This is a preferred site which is currently not supported by any developer requirements.   |  | Noted. If inclusion of this preferred site in the Plan gives it any planning status, then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>“Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development.”</i> |
| 85   | 14       | Site issue | 3E            | Support for proposal to establish “all access” accommodation.  |  |  |
| 86   | 8, 14    | Site issue | 3F            | Support for this proposal, and the need to ensure cycle provision is accounted for in proposed path improvement.                 |  | CLUP addresses issue in Appendix 1 (p. 50).  |
| 87   | SEPA     | Site issue | 3G            | If inclusion of this potential site in the Plan gives it any planning status then appropriate flood risk issues to be addressed. |  | Noted, and if planning status awarded, then the finalised developer requirements should include: <i>“Flood risk from the small watercourse may need to be investigated. A buffer of at least 6 m should be observed between the top of the bank of the watercourse and any development.”</i>   |
| 88   | 8, 9, 15 | Site issue | 3K<br>M N     | Concern that any development at Toscaig beyond a ferry terminal will increase vehicle usage in the South,                        | Given the additional pressure placed on infrastructure, and the potential impact on neighbouring |  |

| Item                            | Ind. ID  | Theme      | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue  |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|---------------|---|---|---|
|                                 |          |            |               | and negatively impact on the quality of life for South Applecross residents.  | properties along the approach to Toscaig Pier, the proposed development to be limited to activities directly related to the transport function preferred by Highland Council.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Development related to retail and primary tourist activity (non-transport related) removed from Toscaig Pier Key Site Analysis. Text to also show the need to limit the impact on neighbouring properties and residents for any future development.</b> |   |
| 89                              | 1, 14    | Site issue | 3K<br>M N     | Support for revitalisation of Toscaig Pier.   |   | Noted.  |
| 90                              | SEPA     | Site issue | 3K<br>M N     | Much of the area may be flood risk. The current proposed development does not include housing so is less vulnerable to flood risk. Consider a reference to future-proofing proposed developments from flood-risk. | <b>Change:</b><br><b>The following text added to Design and Form: 'Any proposed use of this site will need to mitigate for coastal flood risk'.</b>   |   |
| 91                              | 6        | Site issue | 3L            | Concern that Toscaig Ferry proposal is financially unviable due to road investment and site construction costs.   |   | Noted. It is recommended that long term viability concerns are raised with the developer directly and through the planning application process. |
| 92                              | 4, 7, 8  | Site Issue | 3L            | Support for ferry service to ease traffic.  |   | Noted.  |
| <b>Grammar/Text/Corrections</b> |          |            |               |   |   |   |
| 93                              | 7, 8, 15 | Wording    |               | Given the community's preference for the community hall to continue as a hub for community activity, the use of   | Affirm difference between Visitor Attraction and Community Hub from workshop expression of term.  |   |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme                           | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion  | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
|      |         |                                 |               | the term Visitor Attraction should be used throughout the document as Visitor Hub is confusing.   | <b>Change:</b><br><b>Visitor Attraction used in replacement for Hub on pages 4, 5, 15, 29.</b>   |  |
| 94   | 7       | Wording                         |               | Graph showing age of cohort over 60 on page 3 does not match figure given in preceding statement.   | Incorrect reference to be corrected.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Reference number for those over 60 given on page 3 to be altered to show 35%.</b>   |  |
| 95   | SEPA    | Drainage and sewage definitions |               | Incongruent use of the terms 'Drainage' and 'Sewage' in detailed site analysis, where drainage has been used to describe sewage services, e.g. a septic tank soakaway is a sewage system, not drainage. | Need to ensure correct usage of terms.<br><b>Change:</b><br><b>Re-wording of Sewage descriptions for all Preferred Site analysis.</b><br><br><b>All Sewage descriptions to show either: 'Public sewerage system required.' for those sites in and around the main village, Camusterrach &amp; west of Camustiel' or, for those sites outside of these areas, 'Private system required'.</b><br><br><b>All drainage descriptions to be removed.</b> |  |
| 96   | SEPA    | Referencing                     |               | The reference of the Toscaig sites seems to be incorrect on page 46.  | <b>Change:</b><br><b>Change unique reference numbers on pages 46 to 3K L M N.</b>  |  |
| 97   | SEPA    | Status of Sites                 |               | Map 5 identifies Toscaig as a potential site, but it includes a detailed Site   | Consistency error.<br><b>Change:</b>   |  |

| Item | Ind. ID | Theme            | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion   | Change if required with reasoning  | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
|      |         |                  |               | Analysis; we therefore query whether it is actually a Preferred Site.  | <b>To be referred to as Potential site, as per overall change to all sites noted in Item 25.</b>   |  |
| 98   | 4       | Missing Material |               | Business premises proposal which came from Charrette left out of Appendix 1, draft CLUP in publishing error. | <p>Correct error.</p> <p><b>Change:</b><br/> <b>Item related to business units now included in Appendix 1 to CLUP to show proposal as suggested in workshops. New item to be added titled 'Identify Sites for new business premises' under 'Local economy' and the following to sit under</b></p> <p><b>Principles/Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Potential Types:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Flexible office space.</b></li> <li>o <b>Garage / car workshop (for locals and tourists).</b></li> <li>o <b>Laundry Facility (for locals and tourists). Meet local commercial /hospitality demand.</b></li> <li>o <b>Waste Service (for campervans – septic waste). Need to consider the infrastructure required to do this. Could be multiple units @ ¼ acre for each unit.</b></li> <li>o <b>Workshops – local trades and crafted goods.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Delivery considerations:</b></li> </ul> |  |



| Item | Ind. ID | Theme | Loc. (pg no.) | Comment/Suggestion | Change if required with reasoning   | Response if no change made and additional comments if CLUP addresses issue |
|------|---------|-------|---------------|--------------------|---|--|
|      |         |       |               |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Should be infrastructure led, requirements such as 3 phase and road access will be critical.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Concern about identifying sites on crofting land, if any proposal results in a net loss of land.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Small business units could be scattered in small groups.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>A need to focus on local people and local business.</i></p> |  |