<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 18</th>
<th>SLEAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Development plan reference:** Sleat Settlement Chapter, Pages 139-146  
**Reporter:**

**Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):**

- Alan and Wendy Richmond (997715)
- Andrew Milner (1103156)
- Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
- Armelle Sandeman (1105140)
- B Thompson (1103290)
- Cathy Black (997342)
- Christopher Marsh (997494)
- Clan Donald Lands Trust (1105772)
- Cornelia Hetterich (1104123)
- Duncan MacInnes (992306)
- Fearann Eilean Iarmain (995590)
- Geoffrey Stephenson (1100908)
- Hazel Morrison (1100930)
- Heather Dodgson (995910)
- Keith Butler (991408)
- Kevin Donnelly (997567)
- Kevin Williams (1028162)
- Maggie Zerafa (1029963)
- Norman Sandeman (1099724)
- Olena Beal (994167)
- Philip Taylor (994165)
- Roveana Cleland (1116579)
- RSPB (1104965)
- Sleat Community Council (1104998)
- Sleat General Grazings Committee (997691)
- Stephen Heap (1029961)
- Steve Hall (1103275)

**Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:** Placemaking Priorities, Settlement Maps, Site Allocations with Developer Requirements

**Planning authority’s summary of the representation(s):**

**General**

Kevin Donnelly (997567)

Asserts that “East Sleat” should not be classified as a Main Settlement in the hierarchy because the presence and success of the Gaelic College, Sabhal Mòr Ostaig and its related employment is fragile and could be undermined by large scale development in the surrounding area, which would swamp the college and the wider community’s Gaelic-speaking environment that underpins its success.

Keith Butler (991408)
Objects to Teangue and the Sleat Peninsula being classed as a Main Settlement (assumed) for the following reasons: poor internet services; few general resources e.g. service stations, grocery facilities, shops; no local shops in Teangue; medical services already stretched and if more retired people move to the area this will stretch services further; shortage of dentists; few veterinary services; difficult to recruit professional staff to a rural area; infrequent bus services; impact of light pollution; ferry traffic passes through this area which with increased congestion due to visitors to the new distillery will increase the risk of road accidents; and, the attraction of this rural area is the beauty and uncluttered views of the hills and sea and if it becomes a housing estate then the term ‘The Garden of Skye’ will be irrelevant and the appeal to tourists will diminish.

Sleat General Grazings Committee (997691)
Objects to Plan’s presumption against single house development on croft land and the concentration of larger new developments within existing SDAs. Reports that the community council supports an alternative approach of continued single house developments on in-byre croft land and anything larger (particularly groups of affordable housing for local young people) should be community led on sites outwith settlements. Accepts that this approach might be inhibited by a lack of services including no public transport and the poor condition of single-track roads, many of which need urgent attention.

Placemaking Priorities
Andrew Milner (1103156)
Objects to the first Placemaking Priority because this means that farmland is used for development which is detrimental to the viability of the local farm. Objects to Teangue being described in the second Placemaking Priority as an area with existing clusters of development as there are only a few moderately sized buildings above the hotel and the area proposed for development is in excess of the area occupied by this small cluster.

Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Objects to the reference to Teangue in the second bullet point in the Placemaking Priorities as it is a scattered settlement, there are no shops or facilities, the bus service is poor and the new Torabhaig Distillery will only support 2 or 3 full time jobs.

Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Agrees with the general presumption of preserving croft land from single house speculative development and steering major developments away from outlying townships towards the Main Settlement area. However, believes the Plan should recognise and make exception for small-scale community led developments, including affordable housing, outwith the Main Settlement because concentrating affordable housing in main settlements is gradually emptying the outlying townships of young people and families and without them traditional land management activities are unable to continue. Also because mainstream social landlords tend only to develop in Main Settlements so any affordable housing in outlying townships will need to be community led and therefore the Plan should not hinder this sort of development.

RSPB (1104965)
Requests an additional Placemaking Priority regarding green networks to ensure consistency with other settlements. Seeks amendment to second Placemaking Priority because in the relevant legislation there is no significance test for an adverse effect on the integrity of an SAC designation.
Manse Field (ES01)
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
Objects for the following reasons: approval has recently been given for a single dwelling house within ES01 (site reference 16/01528/FUL) which SCC objected to on landscape and loss of agricultural land reasons; the land is prime agricultural land which is actively used for the grazing of livestock; it forms part of the last working farm in Sleat; in comparison with, for example, areas on the east coast of Scotland, there is very little prime agricultural land left in the Sleat peninsula; 65% of Sleat is under crofting tenure; there are many other potential sites for housing development in the Sleat area without the need to utilise good farming land; there are already planning permissions for 11 houses at Exhibition Cottage adjacent to the Sleat Medical Centre and other housing development at the new Kilbeg village; and, the Teangue / Ferrindonald SDA (north east boundary) should be reduced to protect a significant area of farmland. Also submits a composite justification document [RD27].

Sleat General Grazings Committee (SGGC) (997691)
Objects because: site borders croft land and is used by crofters; site has similar if not better agricultural productivity than other in bye land within Sleat (the fields have been classed as Region 1 by SGRPID which is the highest category of land quality and which attracts the highest support payment); of loss of crofting identity and lifestyles; other better alternative sites at Armadale, the Gaelic College and Kilbeg, the latter which already has planning permission for 91 houses; of adverse impact on crofting landscape which tourists come to see; of loss of biodiversity because of loss of improved pasture habitat; and, the reduced viability of farm unit that uses site.

Norman Sandeman (1099724), Heather Dodgson (995910), Hazel Morrison (1100930), Kevin Donnelly (997567), Alan and Wendy Richmond (997715), Duncan MacInnes (992306), B Thompson (1103290), Andrew Milner (1103156), Steve Hall (1103275), Stephen Heap (1029961), Philip Taylor (994165), Olena Beal (994167), Christopher Marsh (997494), Armelle Sandeman (1105140), Cathy Black (997342), Roveana Cleland (1116579)
Respondents object to allocation for one or more of the following reasons: site is worked by a local crofting family and is therefore against the spirit of the Council’s policy of protecting better croft and other agriculturally productive land; site is good quality arable land; prime agricultural land must be protected; a young Gaelic speaking family have farmed the land for many years and should be encouraged to continue; croftland must be protected, especially actively used land; land is an attractive and prominent site and the unspoilt nature adds to the visitor experience of the area; views such as from the Cnoc Castle would be adversely impacted upon; there is no demand for additional houses in this area; many housing plots remain undeveloped; there is strong local opposition to the site being developed; the landowner is the only person to benefit for the development of the site; the landowner holds large areas of land and there are plenty of alternative sites which are better suited for development, e.g. near the Hub at Isle Ornsay; the site is an important habitat for wildlife including bats which are protected species; Japanese Knotweed borders the site which could undermine its development; development of 3.4 ha of land would be out of keeping with the settlement pattern of the local area, which is scattered homesteads; few new houses have been built alongside the main road; there is a lack of supporting infrastructure for the development of the site, including limited water supply, broadband network, elderly care provision, primary school capacity and poor public transport provision;
the increase in housing in the area is already causing more frequent problems with surface water drainage; it would lead to a dramatic and unwanted increase in light pollution (including the possibility of introducing street lighting); the local community are proud and protective of their Dark Night status; there isn’t enough employment to support the new residents; the new distillery will require very few employees; and, road access will be on to the A851 which is already a fast and potentially dangerous corner at the bottom of a downhill section. Kevin Donnelly submits additional justification documents [RD25 and RD26].

**West of Youth Hostel (ES02)**
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
Supports the site being allocated for housing, including open-market, affordable, special needs and sheltered housing, due to it’s proximity to services, transport, shops and employment opportunities.

Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Supports allocation because it is close to services such as post office, shop, transport etc. and would be suitable location for supported housing for older people, which is not currently available in Sleat, but which is needed. A community-led development would be best. Agrees with the indicative capacity and the developer requirements to respect the existing mature treeline around the eastern and southern edges of the field, as well as set back from the landscape planting established along the roadside and the requirement to safeguard public access to the beach.

Kevin Williams (1028162)
Supports allocation.

Maggie Zerafa (1029963)
Supports allocation, its capacity and its developer requirements.

**Between the Potteries (ES03)**
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
References terms of previous planning permission.

Fearann Eilean Iarmain (FEI) (995590)
Reports that, as landowner, it is preparing development proposals for this site and that these have been amended to take account of the results of community engagement. Reports that this may include business and retail uses, however the flexibility and deliverability of a development on this site would be enhanced by the addition of some housing, including live/work, as an additional use.

Maggie Zerafa (1029963), Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Supports business and commercial uses on the site but not housing because Armadale is a great trading location and this is one of the last remaining opportunities to locate new businesses and employment creation activities in the area. Supports the developer requirements to protect woodland along Armadale Bay and the integrity of the green network treelines along the shore and the eastern edge.

**Armadale Bay (ES04)**
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
Reports the aspiration of the Scottish Government via Caledonian Maritime Assets Ltd and
CalMac Ferries Ltd for future expansion of Armadale Harbour which will include an enlarged marshalling and car parking area. A paper has been produced for Highland Council from the Sleat Transport Forum and SCC welcomes the opportunity to contribute to these discussions and ask that indicative sums be added to future capital plans. Supports the developer requirement relating to the protection of the Minches SAC.

Kevin Williams (1028162)
Supports the allocation.

Maggie Zerafa (1029963)
Supports marine leisure and tourism related development as long as it recognises the need to protect the woodland along the shoreline and the Bay and the need to protect the view from the sea coming into Armadale.

Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Conditionally supports the principle of marine leisure and tourism related development, but development proposals should also demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact on the integrity of the wooded shoreline, both from a landscape and local amenity perspective.

Geoffrey Stephenson (1100908)
Seeks clarification on what "Northern access may require upgrading or new access formed; Retain beach access." Means. If it means opening up the northern end of Allt a 'Tuath road end, then claims that all residents of the Allt a 'Tuath development will object to it as evidenced by their response to a previous consultation (undefined).

Kilbeg Village (ES05)
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
Supports the allocation, particularly for low-cost accommodation and sheltered housing.

Clan Donald Lands Trust (1105772), received 26 July 2017
Supports the allocation for mixed use development.

Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Conditionally supports allocation but only if its development is managed and nurtured to happen gradually and organically, in full consultation with the college, thus allowing a mainly Gaelic-speaking community to grow up naturally around the college because the success of the College is fragile and depends upon the preservation of a Gaelic-speaking environment. If not then “a forced” development it could “kill” the College. The indicative capacity of 93 houses over the lifetime of the Plan is too high. The main need is for rented accommodation, particularly accommodation suitable for families, owned and managed by the College as this might enable students to stay in the area and find employment.

Land Adjacent to Kilbeg Village North of A851 (ES06)
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
Supports site for longer-term development opportunities (assumed).

Clan Donald Lands Trust (1105772), received 26 July 2017
Seeks extension as per map supplied [RD24] of allocation to include all of the fields at this location. Queries why part of the fields have been excluded from the allocation boundary.

Duncan MacInnes (992306)
Objects for the following reasons: land is crossed by two private water supplies and a private storage tank at the northern end; land is crossed east to west by the main water supply to Ardvasar which limits the amount of land that could be built on; it is divided by a north south covered stream which is open at the top and bottom and must have a 6 metre exclusion zone; it can not be screened form the A851 road; it is good agricultural land which only appears as unsuitable for agriculture due to 40 years of neglect by the land-owner; it shows no consideration for the local community and there been no communication about what is being proposed; and, development will lead to greater water flow from ground drains which will have an impact on land downstream and this cannot be mitigated.

Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Conditionally supports allocation but only if its development is managed and nurtured to happen gradually and organically, in full consultation with the college, thus allowing a mainly Gaelic-speaking community to grow up naturally around the college because the success of the College is fragile and depends upon the preservation of a Gaelic-speaking environment. If not then “a forced” development it could “kill” the College. The site is visible from the start of the walk up to Tarskavaig road, which is a popular walk and therefore good design and tree planting will be necessary.

Christopher Marsh (997494)
Objects because this allocation will lead to the loss of good grazing ground (agricultural activity and economic impacts), will have an adverse visual impact on the whole area, and there is already a substantial area being proposed for residential development at ES05 Kilbeg.

Knock (ES07)
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
Supports the allocation and the employment the distillery provides (assumed).

Armelle Sandeman (1105140)
Queries whether there is any more development potential beyond the planning permission that has been implemented. Opposes further development.

Olena Beal (994167)
Opposes further development on allocation because: this is an area of unsurpassable views down the Sound of Sleat and across to Knoydart and across the farmland to Knock Bay and Knock Castle, which should all be protected; the distillery needs surrounding rural space to remain a special sensitive development; and, the term “mixed use” is an unspecified item.

Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Opposes much more development at this site for the following reasons: it is prominent in views from Tenague and Saasaig; it is a beautiful area; its is adjacent to Knock Castle, a popular viewpoint for tourists; its is adjacent to the sea and Knock beach and beaches are scarce in Skye; it is within a dark sky area; and, significant development could detract from the visitor experience and economy of the new Torabhaig distillery.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

General
Kevin Donnelly (997567), Keith Butler (991408)
Deletion of Sleat as a Main Settlement (assumed).
Placemaking Priorities
Andrew Milner (1103156)
Delete first placemaking priority (assumed).

Kevin Donnelly (997567), Keith Butler (991408), Andrew Milner (1103156)
Remove reference to Teangue from the second bullet point in the Placemaking Priorities (assumed).

Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
More positive policies for small-scale community led developments in the outlying townships of Sleat (assumed).

Alan and Wendy Richmond (997715)
Remove allocations for development at Teangue (assumed).

RSPB (1104965)
Include additional Placemaking Priority: Preserve and extend Sleat’s green networks. In the second Placemaking Priority, “significant adverse impact” should be replaced with “adverse effect”.

Manse Field (ES01)
Norman Sandeman (1099724), Heather Dodgson (995910), Hazel Morrison (1100930), Kevin Donnelly (997567), Alan and Wendy Richmond (997715), Duncan MacInnes (992306), B Thompson (1103290), Andrew Milner (1103156), Steve Hall (1103275), Stephen Heap (1029961), Philip Taylor (994165), Olena Beal (994167), Christopher Marsh (997494), Armelle Sandeman (1105140), Cathy Black (997342), Roveana Cleland (1116579)
Deletion of allocation ES01.

Between the Potteries (ES03)
Fearann Eilean Iarmain (995590)
Broadening of the list of acceptable uses to include housing and/or live/work space.

Armadale Bay (ES04)
Maggie Zerafa (1029963)
Amended developer requirements: protect the woodland along the shoreline and the Bay; protect the view from the sea coming into Armadale (assumed).

Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Amended developer requirements: no adverse impact on the integrity of the wooded shoreline both from a landscape and local amenity perspective (assumed).

Geoffrey Stephenson (1100908)
Deletion of allocation if access is to be taken from the northern end of allt a ‘tuath road end (assumed).

Kilbeg Village (ES05)
Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Lower indicative capacity (assumed).
Land Adjacent to Kilbeg Village North of A851 (ES06)
Clan Donald Lands Trust (1105772)
Extend the boundary to the extent of the respondent’s ownership.

Duncan MacInnes (992306), Christopher Marsh (997494)
Deletion of allocation (assumed).

Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Addition of developer requirement: “good design; and tree planting will be necessary”.

Knock (ES07)
Armelle Sandeman (1105140), Olena Beal (994167)
Deletion of allocation (assumed).

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

General
Kevin Donnelly (997567), Keith Butler (991408)
The Plan’s settlement hierarchy has been determined looking at a range of criteria including: the size of the existing population and housing stock; the size, catchment and spare capacity of existing and proposed infrastructure provision; and, the need and demand for development (particularly the buoyancy of the local housing market expressed through recent house completions and housing need expressed through the Common Housing Register “waiting list” numbers). The crofting and other settlements that occupy the eastern coastal margins of Sleat, collectively, meet these criteria for classification as a main settlement. For example: the A851 spine road has seen significant recent investment and is a primary tourist route; the local housing waiting list figures are higher than many other parts of Skye and Lochalsh; the area continues to be subject to significant (relative to the rest of Skye and Lochalsh) development pressure as evidenced by 127 new house completions in Sleat between 2000 and 2014; and Sleat benefits from a diverse range of employment opportunities and community / commercial facilities (a primary school, a college, a health centre, local shops and hotels). Although some of the local facilities and infrastructure networks (notably water and sewerage) have capacity issues, the Council believes Sleat (compared to other settlements) is well placed to accommodate limited growth. No part of the Highland Council area has spare capacity in all of its community and commercial facilities and infrastructure networks. Mr Butler’s expected range of facilities would be more akin to that available within a very accessible and well served urban area. It is more reasonable to expect a level of service, facility and infrastructure provision proportionate to the remoteness of a location and the population catchment it can offer to public and commercial service providers. Classification as a Main Settlement means that that growth is subject to more specific development plan guidance and should therefore be better directed and managed. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this issue.

Sleat General Grazings Committee (997691)
The views of the Grazings Committee (and the reported views of Sleat Community Council) are shared by many community groups across Highland. West Highland in particular has a tradition of dispersed rather than clustered development and a settlement pattern based on crofting townships served by rural parish-wide catchment facilities. This means that many
settlements lack a defined, nucleated core. Unfortunately, this pattern is not replicated in many other parts of Scotland and is not environmentally and commercially sustainable in the modern world and therefore national planning guidance does not favour its repetition or continuation in terms of the location of new development. Instead national, and to a degree Highland-wide guidance, supports the principle that most new development should occur within established settlement boundaries because, other things being equal, this will be more sustainable in environmental terms and more cost efficient in terms of existing and new public infrastructure and private commercial facility provision. For example, scattered groups of affordable housing will generally cost more to connect to a road, a public sewer, to broadband, to a bus route, to a suitable water supply, and will not all be within a walkable distance of a school, health centre, shop and other facilities. Again, other things being equal, scattered groups of houses unrelated to any existing settlement, tend to have greater landscape impacts. This context explains why the Plan takes the approach it does of guiding new development to existing settlements and locations where at least some landscape, facility and infrastructure capacity exists. In terms of single house developments then the Highland Council’s collective development plan policies do not preclude single house developments on crofting in-bye land. Instead, they seek to minimise the loss of the better land. Sleat, on certain crofts for example at Ferrindonald, has experienced the worst effects of a proliferation of single house developments. These include steep, unadopted side roads serving several houses, a suburbanisation of the crofting landscape, and local sub soils and watercourses that are having to carry pollution from an excessive density of individual septic tank and soakaway private foul drainage facilities. Given these constraints then the Council believes that a more permissive approach for single house developments within the SDAs would be inappropriate. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this issue.

Placemaking Priorities
Andrew Milner (1103156), Kevin Donnelly (997567)
Given the Council’s suggested, amended position in respect of allocation ES01 (see below) then if the Reporter agrees then the Placemaking Priorities should be amended. The first should read: “Protect in bye croft land from larger development proposals.” The second should read: “Consolidate existing clusters of development and facilities at Armadale and Kilbeg.”

Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Support for the first Placemaking Priority is noted (but see change commended above). The Council recognises the importance of crofting to environmental management and to the social structure of an area. As set out in Policy 48 New/Extended Crofting Townships of HwLDP, the Council supports the creation of new crofts and opportunities exist for the development of new croft houses on worked land where the proposal can meet the required criteria, such as its compatibility with the landscape character, the economic viability of service delivery and there is a need to live close on the croft. Therefore the principle of limited development within the Sleat townships that lie outwith the Main Settlement SDAs is supported by the provisions of the HwLDP. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this issue.

RSPB (1104965)
It was not considered necessary to include a Placemaking Priority relating to green networks as the largest SDA for Ferrindonald and Teangue covers an extensive area and has a scattered enough existing and proposed settlement pattern to not block connectivity
along existing burnsides and other corridors. Particular connectivity issues are picked up in the site allocations for the other SDAs. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this issue. In terms of the suggested deletion of the word “significant”, if the Reporter agrees then the Council would support this change for the sake of consistency with the HRA and relevant legislation.

**Manse Field (ES01)**
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998), Sleat General Grazings Committee (SGGC) (997691), Norman Sandeman (1099724), Heather Dodgson (995910), Hazel Morrison (1100930), Kevin Donnelly (997567), Alan and Wendy Richmond (997715), Duncan Macllnnes (992306), B Thompson (1103290), Andrew Milner (1103156), Steve Hall (1103275), Stephen Heap (1029961), Philip Taylor (994165), Olena Beal (994167), Christopher Marsh (997494), Armelle Sandeman (1105140), Cathy Black (997342), Roveana Cleland (1116579)

Since the site’s inclusion in the Proposed Plan, the landowner’s agent has confirmed in writing [CD54] that the owner no longer wishes to release the land for development. The Council would not use its compulsory purchase powers to activate a housing site where other credible alternatives exist. Accordingly, the site is very unlikely to contribute to the effective land supply and if the Reporter agrees then it should be deleted from the Plan. The loss of its 13 unit capacity is unlikely to be prejudicial to matching supply, demand and housing need within Sleat or across the housing market area as a whole and therefore the Council does not believe it necessary to allocate a replacement site. The Council believes that the land on which the allocation sits together with that to its north and east, should remain within the Ferrindonald Teangue SDA as it could and should still be capable of accommodating development with a land management requirement. This wider area of land should not be embargoed from development for the following reasons: the land is classified identified as 5.1 in terms of its capability for agriculture and is therefore not prime farmland; built development in close proximity to the A851 is a common feature of the Main Settlement area and replicating this pattern would be appropriate; it is south / south east facing and sheltered from the prevailing westerly winds; ground conditions are good for construction and foul drainage; woodland and other nature conservation features would not be affected by development of the land; there is currently sufficient capacity within the existing primary school (Bun-sgoil Shlèite school roll stands at 69% of the total capacity of 100 pupils) and secondary school (Portree High which is at 52% of a total capacity of 982 pupils); it is located alongside the main A851 road to Armadale; it benefits from being close to a reasonable bus service; and light pollution issues can be mitigated by suitable layout, design and management.

**West of Youth Hostel (ES02)**
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998), Andrew Prendergast (1029023), Kevin Williams (1028162), Maggie Zerafa (1029963)

Support for the allocation and its provisions are welcomed. To address concerns expressed towards ES04 regarding the potential upgrading of the pier access road, if the Committee / Reporter is so minded, then the Council would be content with the following Developer Requirement being added to ES02 “Development of ES02 should allow for improved access to ES04”. This will help to ensure that a coordinated approach is taken to improving access to the pier which should remain accessible to users and the wider public.

**Between the Potteries (ES03)**
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998), Maggie Zerafa (1029963), Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
Support for business and retail uses on the site is noted, as is the support for the developer requirements relating to the green network and safeguarding woodland.

Fearann Eilean Iarmain (FEI) (995590)
Whilst the Council recognises the need for all allocations to be viable within the lifetime of the Plan, the site is one of very few in Sleat that has the competitive commercial advantage of frontage to the A851 tourist route and close proximity to the ferry waiting area with its “captive” market of ferry passengers waiting for the next available sailing. The Council (as reflected in its Placemaking Priorities) wishes to promote a chain of tourist facilities and enterprises along the A851 route to increase its collective interest as part of making the A830 and A851 an attractive alternative “Route to the Isles” alongside the A87 Skye Bridge route. There could be opportunity for living space to be provided above business and retail premises but not at ground level. ES02 provides a suitable and adequate allocation for housing at Armadale. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this issue.

Armadale Bay (ES04)
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998), Kevin Williams (1028162), Maggie Zerafa (1029963), Andrew Prendergast (1029023)
The allocation does not include much of the woodland area along the bay. The woodland around the shoreline, part of which falls into the northern tip of the allocation, is shown as part of the green network. If the Reporter is so minded, then the Council would be content for a developer requirement to be added which recognises the importance of protecting the woodland, such as “Protect and where possible enhance the woodland within and bordering the allocation”. Concerns over the impact of development on the views of the bay are accepted. Developer requirements for high quality siting and design have typically been included for sites which are in prominent location in order to minimise the visual impact of any new built development. To protect the views of the Bay, if the Reporter is so minded then the following Developer Requirement could be added: “High standard of architectural siting and design”.

Geoffrey Stephenson (1100908)
The Developer Requirement “Northern access may require upgrading or new access formed” relates to the land at the former youth hostel. The land adjoining the current access road to the pier is in a separate ownership to the former youth hostel. Therefore, it was considered that if the existing road cannot be upgraded then a potential developer may need to consider a new access from the A851. It is not the intention that access to the harbour would be taken from the housing at Allt A’Tuath. To help clarify this position, if the Reporter is so minded then the Council would be content with the developer requirement “Northern access may require upgrading or new access formed” being deleted and replaced with “Existing vehicular access to the pier may require upgrading or new access formed from the A851 (access from Allt A’Tuath will not be accepted)”.

Kilbeg Village (ES05)
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998), Clan Donald Lands Trust (1105772), Support noted and welcomed.

Kevin Donnelly (997567)
The indicative housing capacity identified in the Plan is reflective of the remaining capacity of the planning permission (10/04329/PIP) which was granted in 2012. As development has commenced on part of the site the permission is extant and not time limited. The planning system cannot (and perhaps should not) control the specific occupiers of a development or their (choice of) first language. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this site.

**Land Adjacent to Kilbeg Village North of A851 (ES06)**  
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)

Support noted.

**Kevin Donnelly (997567)**

The planning system cannot (and perhaps should not) control the specific occupiers of a development or their (choice of) first language. Due to the undulating land and mature woodland surrounding the site it is relatively well screened. However, some parts of the site are prominent from the short section of the A851 to the south. Therefore, if the Reporter is so minded then the Council would be content with the following additional developer requirement: “High quality of architectural siting and design”. There is already a large number of trees and bushes bounding the site and a developer requirement is in place to “Protect and enhance boundary trees”.

**Clan Donald Lands Trust (1105772)**

The additional area of land requested by the respondent was rejected due to its surface water flooding issues and likely poor ground conditions. Most likely the area would be required to accommodate increased surface water run-off from the allocated site. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of this site.

**Duncan MacInnes (992306), Christopher Marsh (997494)**

The presence of water supply infrastructure is a detailed layout consideration but is not relevant to the principle of development because enough land is developable to make it a viable site. Water infrastructure can be designed around or diverted. If the Reporter feels it necessary to draw this issue to the attention of prospective developers then the Council would be content that the following developer requirement be added: “Safeguard mains water supply pipeline”. The Council already recognises the impact that the development could have on watercourses and a developer requirement is included for a minimum 6 metre buffer between watercourses and development. The Council does not accept that the site needs additional screening from the A851. There is already a developer requirement to protect and enhance boundary trees. The site sits close to the Gaelic College and other development fronting the A851. The allocation is classed as 5.1 in terms of its Land Capability for Agriculture (‘improved grassland) which is not recognised as prime or of other high agricultural value. The land management practices of a particular owner are not a matter for the Plan. The Council accepts that surface water drainage issues exist hence the allocation boundary and developer requirement for a Drainage Impact Assessment. The site is within active travel distance to the Sabhal Mor Ostaig college campus, which is a major employer in the area, and has good links onto the A851 but provides housing site choice for those not wishing to live directly on campus.

**Knock (ES07)**  
Sleat Community Council (SCC) (1104998)
The site is allocated for defined mixed uses (including Community, Business/Tourism) to provide support for the new distillery and any associated development. The distillery commenced production of whisky in January 2017 but the visitor facilities, including the café and shop, are expected to open in 2018. The Council propose to retain the allocation to provide ongoing support for the remaining undeveloped components of the planning consent and any required but related expansion. Any further development will also be subject to the proposals meeting other planning considerations such as visual and landscape impact and compatibility with the Listed Building. Any potential light pollution issues can be mitigated by suitable layout, design and management. Accordingly, the Council believes the Plan content should remain unaltered in respect of these issues.

Reporter’s conclusions:

Reporter’s recommendations: