**23/00580/FUL**

THE GOLF COURSE PROPOSED AGAIN AT COUL LINKS

REMEMBER, A VERY SIMILAR COURSE WAS REFUSED PLANNING PERMISSION IN 2020, ON MULTIPLE SERIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL GROUNDS, AFTER A 2019 4-WEEK INQUIRY BEFORE TWO REPORTERS

EVIDENCE FOR OBJECTING

This is a working document

† and will be updated in March and April 2023 as our evidence assembly and assessment

† of applicant work progresses

That evidence is tested using the findings of the 2019 Coul Public Local Inquiry for a similar golf course largely on protected land. See DPEA ([www.gov.scot](http://www.gov.scot))

That very similar golf course proposal was refused planning permission by Scottish Ministers in 2020 – see https://tinyurl.com/2b2rkmcj

†Assessment is based on planning policies in Caithness & Sutherland, Highland Region and NPF4 (2023 National Planning Framework 4). In particular see

1. Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP)at www.highland.gov.uk/info/178/development\_plans/199/highland-wide\_local\_development\_plan, especially Policy 57, page 111

2. For NPF4, "download" at www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/documents/, especially Policies 3 and 4 on pages 38-41

**Objecting: Getting it started, making it clear**

Are you in a rush, really wanting to object but not sure how to start and have little time to read everything? Why not re-work the ‘generic’ objection below, to make it ‘yours’?

NB See separate instructions (How to Object) on submitting an objection online, or by letter, or by email (if >5000 characters online)

Ensure your name and address are entered, state application reference: 23/00580/FUL

Dear Sir,

I object to this planning application for a golf course, much of which is on protected land at Coul Links. Or is it two courses? - that is unclear. Most of the big course is on triple-protected land (SSSI, SPA, Ramsar) and approval is likely to be against Policy 57 in the HWLDP. It is obviously contrary to policies on the climate and biodiversity crises in our latest guidance: NPF4 (Policies 3 and 4).

An earlier very similar 2017 proposal (17/04601/FUL) was not recommended for approval by your own officials in 2018, a view vindicated by Scottish Ministers’ refusal of permission in 2020 for a very long list of environmental reasons. The 2019 Inquiry over 4 weeks heard a host of experts, the likely adverse environmental impacts were thoroughly explored. The decision in 2020 should have been final. There was no appeal.

My specific concern(s) on this very similar application is/are :

(that is 899 characters with spaces – room for plenty more before 5000 limit)

†This is a working document – what does that mean?

If necessary, Not Coul will change the information here as it prepares its detailed objection, and if it receives a reliable challenge. We want the information here to be correct, sound content, for use by fair-minded people. It will be updated with additional evidence, comment and assessment as that is produced.

N.B. Not Coul is receiving opinion from independent professional experts

These are people of national or international standing; Highlights from that advice will be detailed here, once they are received.

The fees for those experts have to be paid. Please help by DONATING to Not Coul at [www.notcoul.org](http://www.notcoul.org)
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