

**THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL  
CULLODEN ACADEMY STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

**Minutes of Meeting No. 3  
Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2021 at 7 PM**

<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b><u>Highland Councillors</u></b> Councillor Trish Robertson</p> <p><b><u>Parent Council Representatives</u></b> Jeni Alexander – Chair Allyson Hill Graham Hopper</p> <p><b><u>Community Representatives</u></b> Catherine Bunn, Culloden Community Council Pip Johnson, Balloch Community Council</p> <p><b><u>Culloden Academy</u></b> Dr James Vance, Head Teacher Alan Robertson, Principal Teacher</p> <p><b><u>Highland Council Officials</u></b> Robert Campbell, Estate Strategy Manager Philip Shannon, Consultancy Manager Sarah Fraser, Principal Architect Jane Day, Estates Officer Laura Burns, Project Manager</p> <p><b><u>High Life Highland Officials</u></b> Emma Thompson, Facilities Officer</p>	<p>TR</p> <p>JA AH GH</p> <p>CB PJ</p> <p>JV AR</p> <p>RC PS SF JD LB</p> <p>ET</p>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<p>Councillors Roddy Balfour, Carolyn Caddick, Glynis Campbell-Sinclair, Ken Gowans, Andrew Jarvie and Duncan MacPherson. Finlay MacDonald, Fiona Shearer, Richard Hanna, Craig Steedman, Odette Gordon, Kevin Reid, Gillian Spalding and Jason Hasson.</p>	
<b>Minute:</b>	Jane Day	
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENT</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	JA welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
<b>2</b>	<b>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	Action at 5.5. RC advised that he has enquired about the £100,000 of developer contributions for Woodside of Culloden and will follow this up.	<b>RC</b>
<b>2.2</b>	Item 5.5: TR requested that the wording be amended to clarify the funding sources for the new synthetic playing field at UHI.	

<b>2.3</b>	Item 6.9: AH asked if the image of where the school sits in relation to dualling of the A96 would be produced? SF confirmed that this will be provided.	<b>SF</b>
<b>2.4</b>	Item 5.6: JA asked if the Risk Register will be presented to the Stakeholder Group? LB: A Dashboard Report will be produced for the next meeting that will identify the key risks.	<b>LB</b>
<b>2.5</b>	Item 6.2: JA asked if the Archaeological Report can be distributed to the Group? SF: There is not a formal archaeological report as this was mostly a desktop exercise.	
<b>2.6</b>	The approval of the minutes was proposed by TR and seconded by CB, with an amendment to be incorporated at 5.5.	<b>JD</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>PROJECT UPDATE/TIMESCALES</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	RC shared a presentation. The following are the subsequent questions and answers.	
<b>3.2</b>	TR: Pleased to see progress and asked for this to be maintained.	
<b>3.3</b>	CB: Does the in-house team have sufficient resources to deliver this project and Charleston at the same time? RC: Yes, sufficient resources are in place for both projects. The programme for Charleston will be staggered to follow on from Culloden.	
<b>3.4</b>	RC: A news release will be issued the week after the Scottish Government Election.	<b>RC</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>DESIGN UPDATE</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	SF shared a presentation. The following are the subsequent questions and answers.	
<b>4.2</b>	JA: Asked for further clarification on the Client role? RC: An organogram will be produced for the next meeting clarifying roles and responsibilities.	<b>LB</b>
<b>4.3</b>	GH: Would like to be assured that adequate time will be spent on Stage 2 of the design process, and that the project outcomes are achieved. Keen to see innovation and improvement for the wider community. RC: There are clear outcomes required by the Scottish Government for new school build projects, for example energy efficient buildings. A balance must be struck here given the phased nature of the new building and the relatively tight programme, but we are working across all our projects to ensure that these outcomes are achieved.	
<b>5</b>	<b>AOCB</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	The next meeting will be held on Monday 24 <sup>th</sup> May at 7PM via Microsoft Teams.	

<b>5.2</b>	Meeting was closed by JA at 19:42.	
------------	------------------------------------	--