

The Highland Council

North Planning Applications Committee

Minute of the meeting of the North Planning Applications Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Wednesday 1 August 2018 at 10.30 am.

Committee Members Present:

Mr R Bremner (by video conference), Mrs I Campbell (excluding items 6.1 and 6.6), Ms K Currie, Mr M Finlayson (excluding item 6.2), Mr C Fraser, Mr R Gale, Mr J Gordon (excluding item 6.5), Mr D MacKay, Mrs A MacLean, Mr D MacLeod (excluding items 5.1, 6.2 and 6.5), Mrs M Paterson, Mr A Rhind, Mr K Rosie, Mr A Sinclair and Ms M Smith.

Officials in attendance:

Mr D Jones, Area Planning Manager North
Ms J Bridge, Senior Engineer (Development Management)
Mrs E McArthur, Principal Planner
Mr S Hindson, Principal Planner
Ms G Webster, Planner
Mr B Duncan, Technician, Development and Infrastructure
Mrs K Lyons, Principal Solicitor – Planning and Clerk
Mrs C MacIver, Committee Administrator and Elections Officer
Mrs A MacArthur, Administrative Assistant

Business

Ms Maxine Smith in the Chair

The Chair confirmed that the meeting would be filmed and broadcast over the Internet on the Highland Council website and would be archived and available for viewing for 12 months.

Members were reminded that there was a training session for new Members and substitute Members on 10 August 2018.

1. Apologies Leisgeulan

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr C MacLeod.

2. Declarations of Interest Foillseachaidhean Com-pàirt

Item 6.1 and 6.2 – Mrs I Campbell (financial)
Item 6.2 – Mr M Finlayson (non-financial)

3. **Confirmation of Minutes** **Dearbhadh a' Gheàrr-chunntais**

There had been submitted for confirmation as correct records the:

- i. Minute of Meeting of the North Planning Applications Committee held on 5 June 2018; and
- ii. Minute of Meeting of the North Planning Applications Committee held on 20 June 2018.

which were both **APPROVED**.

4. **Major Development Update** **Iartasan Mòra**

There had been circulated Report No PLN/045/18 by the Head of Planning and Environment providing an update on progress of all cases within the “Major” development category currently with the Planning and Development Service for determination.

The Committee **NOTED** the current position with these applications.

5. **Major Developments – Pre-application consultations** **Leasachaidhean Mòra – Co-chomhairle Ro-iarrtais**

5.1 **Description:** Erection of residential development of 33 houses, including 8 affordable houses, road widening, public footpaths, SUDS basin, open space, and village green; installation of access and infrastructure works for community site for 6 residential units, community and business units (18/01724/PAN) (PLN/046/18)

Ward: 9

Applicant: Tulloch Homes and Culbokie Community Trust

Site Address: Land to North of The Cairns, Culbokie.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/046/18 by the Area Planning Manager on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

The Committee **AGREED** that the following comments be brought to the proposed applicant's attention:

- requirement for transport assessment;
- requirement for flood risk assessment;
- request that the developer take account of the importance of the installation of broadband/fibre infrastructure as part of the development; and
- request that there is a discussion between the developer and the community council regarding developer contributions.

5.2 **Description:** Residential development of 41 houses, associated access and drainage works (18/02597/PAN) (PLN/047/18)

Ward: 9

Applicant: Kirkwood Homes Ltd

Site Address: Rosehaugh South, Avoch.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/047/18 by the Area Planning Manager on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

The Committee **AGREED** that the following comments be brought to the proposed applicant's attention:

- requirement for transport assessment;
- impact of the development on current safer routes to school provision;
- request that the developer take account of the importance of the installation of broadband/fibre infrastructure as part of the development; and
- request that flood risk from surface water is considered.

6. **Planning Applications to be Determined** **Iarrtasan Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh**

Declaration of Interest – Mrs I Campbell, as the applicant, declared a financial interest in this item and left the room for the duration of the item.

Members agreed that as items 6.1 and 6.6 were from the same applicant, they would be taken together.

6.1 **Applicant:** Mrs Isabelle Campbell (17/05564/PIP) (PLN/048/18)

Location: New House, Nostie Kyle (Ward 5).

Nature of Development: Erection of house (planning permission in principal).

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/031/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the Report.

6.6 **Applicant:** Mrs Isabelle Campbell (18/02287/FUL) (PLN/053/18)

Location: Nostie Kyle (Ward 5).

Nature of Development: Formation of access (Retrospective).

Recommendation: Grant.

Declaration of Interest – Mrs I Campbell, as the applicant, declared a financial interest in this item and left the room for the duration of the item.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/031/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report..

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the Report.

6.2 Applicant: Cromartie Estate (18/01017/PIP) (PLN/049/18)

Location: Nutwood, Strathpeffer (Ward 5).

Nature of Development: Erection of 15 houses (renewal of 14/02773/PIP).

Recommendation: Grant.

Declaration of Interest – Mr I Finlayson, declared a non-financial interest in this item as he was related to an objector and left the room for the duration of the item.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/031/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report. The Planning Officer amended her report at page 49 where it referred to 10.6 and should have been 10.20.

The Planning Officer responded to Members' questions as follows:

- the developer was to make improvements to the section of existing core footpath RC45.10 Eagle Stone Path from the field boundary to the A835 to an all abilities surfaced footpath;
- an upgrade to the existing footpath to integrate this housing development within Strathpeffer;
- where there are more than four houses a section 75 agreement is required to provide either affordable housing on site, in the ward or a commuted sum, the section 75 agreement would be modified as recommended in the Report;
- although the proposals are not consistent with the current development plan position, both the extant permission and the fact that the proposals seek to address the reasons that the site allocation was removed from the IMFLDP are material considerations and carry significant weight; and
- previous problems with the access had been overcome.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the report and modification of the existing section 75 agreement.

6.3 Applicant: Mr R Wilkie (18/01441/FUL) (PLN/050/18)

Location: South Obbe, Kyleakin, Isle of Skye (Ward 10).

Nature of Development: Demolition of garage and erection of ancillary accommodation.

Recommendation: Refuse.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/031/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee refuse the application for the reasons stated in the report.

The Planning Officer responded to Members' questions as follows:

- no pre-planning advice had been sought for this application, the planning officer could discuss with the developer other options for a more acceptable development on site;

- the parking at the site was unsuitable with no turning area within the applicant's ownership for cars to enter and leave the property in a forward motion;
- the existing shed was very close to the road and the new ancillary building would be even closer to the road; and
- the removal of the existing garage would be welcomed but the proposed development did not appear to be the best option available to achieve the applicant's aspiration of increasing the available accommodation.

The Committee agreed to **REFUSE** for the reasons given in the report.

6.4 Applicant: Mr and Mrs W Paterson per Planit Highland (18/01789/FUL) (PLN/051/18)

Location: Land East of Salmon Bothy, Rockfield, Portmahomack (Ward 7).

Nature of Development: Erection of holiday letting cabin.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/031/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

6.5 Applicant: K MacRae and Son per Sutherland Drawing Services (18/01811/FUL) (PLN/052/18)

Location: Car park, Durness (Ward 1).

Nature of Development: Erection of three terraced houses.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/031/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report..

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

7. Decisions on Applications to the Scottish Government Directorate for Energy and Climate Change and Planning Appeals **Co-dhùnadh mu larrtas do Bhuidheann-stiùiridh Riaghaltas na h-Alba airson Lùth agus Atharrachadh Aimsir**

7.1 Applicant: Mr Arthur Bruce (16/03651/FUL) (ENA-270-2020)

Location: 30 Argyle Square, Wick, Caithness, KW1 5AL (Ward 3)

Nature of Development: Erection of a shed without planning permission.

The Committee **NOTED** the decision of the Reporter under section 130(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 to uphold the enforcement notice. The Reporter varied the terms of the enforcement notice by deleting the word "shed" in Parts 2 and 4 of the notice and replacing it with the words "masonry outbuilding measuring 5.5 metres by 11.6 metres or thereby" for the reasons stated in the Decision Notice.

8. Additional information requested by Members
Fiosrachadh a bharrachd air iarraidh le Buill

In response to a request for information from the Chair on the Coul Links application in Embo, the Area Planning Manager stated that, following the special meeting of the North Planning Applications Committee in June and notification of the Committee's intention to grant planning permission, the Scottish Government had asked for an extension of time to consider calling in the application.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 12.40 pm.

The Highland Council South Planning Applications Committee

Minute of Meeting of the South Planning Applications Committee which commenced at 9.30 am with a site visit to application site on Land 123M SE of Rosebank, Kingsteps, Lochloy Road, Nairn (Item 6.1) and reconvened at 1.00 pm in the Chamber, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Wednesday 8 August 2018.

Committee Members Present:

Mr R Balfour
Mr B Boyd (excluding item 6.1)
Mr G Cruickshank
Mr L Fraser (excluding items 8.1 and 8.2)
Mr J Gray
Ms P Hadley
Mr T Heggie (excluding item 7.5)
Mr A Jarvie
Mr B Lobban (excluding items 8.1 and 8.2)
Mr R MacWilliam
Mr B Thompson

Non Committee Members Present:

Mr D MacPherson (items 1 – 7.5 only)
Mrs T Robertson (items 1 – 5.2 and 7.1 – 7.4 only)
Mr P Sagers (items 1 – 7.4 only)

Officials in attendance:

Ms N Drummond, Area Planning Manager South/Major Developments
Mr D Mudie, Team Leader
Mrs S Macmillan, Team Leader
Mr M Clough, Senior Engineer, Transport Planning
Mr K McCorquodale, Principal Planner
Ms L Prins, Principal Planner
Mr J Kelly, Planner
Ms S Blease, Principal Solicitor (Clerk)
Miss C McArthur, Solicitor (Regulatory Services)
Mr S Taylor, Administrative Assistant

Mr J Gray in the Chair

Preliminaries

The Chair confirmed that the meeting would be filmed and broadcast over the internet on the Highland Council website and would be archived and available for viewing for 12 months.

Business

1. **Apologies for Absence** **Leisgeulan**

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr A Baxter, Mrs C Caddick, Mrs M Davidson and Mr N McLean.

2. **Declarations of Interest** **Foillseachaidhean Com-pàirt**

None.

3. **Confirmation of Minutes** **Dearbhadh a' Gheàrr-chunntais**

There had been circulated for confirmation as a correct record the minute of the Committee meeting held on 12 June 2018 which was **APPROVED**.

4. **Major Development Update** **Iarrtasàn Mòra**

There had been circulated Report No PLS/051/18 by the Head of Planning and Environment which provided a summary of all cases within the "Major" development category currently with the Planning and Development Service for determination.

During discussion, it was requested that a site visit be arranged for the application for the revised pumped storage scheme at Coire Glas, North Laggan (application reference 18/01564/S36) in anticipation of the application being determined at a future meeting.

Separately, in speaking to the report, the Team Leader confirmed that application reference 18/00760/FUL on Land 325M SW of Whitebridge Cottage, Auchteraw, Fort Augustus was a national development and would subsequently be determined by full Council at a later date.

The Committee **NOTED** the current position and **AGREED** that a site visit be held in relation to application reference 18/01564/S36.

5. **Major Developments – Pre-application consultations** **Leasachaidhean Mòra – Co-chomhairle Ro-iarrtais**

- 5.1 **Description:** Renewal of planning permission in principle application ref: 13/01689/PIP to establish a port and port related services for energy related uses, including marine channel dredging, quay realignment, repair and maintenance, erection of offices, industrial and storage buildings. delivery and export of port related cargo and associated new road access, parking, infrastructure, services, temporary stockpiling of dredged material, regrading and upfilling of landward areas and landscaping. (18/02489/PAN) (PLS/052/18)

Ward: 17 – Culloden and Ardersier

Applicant: Ardersier Port Ltd

Site Address: Former Fabrication Yard, Ardersier, Nairn.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/052/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted no further material planning considerations they wished brought to the applicant's attention other than those identified in the report.

5.2 **Description:** Centre for Health Science 2. (18/03374/PAN) (PLS/053/18)

Ward: 19 – Inverness South

Applicant: NHS Highland

Site Address: Land 330M NW of Inverness College UHI, 1 Inverness Campus, Inverness

There had been circulated Report No PLS/053/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted no further material planning considerations they wished brought to the applicant's attention other than those identified in the report.

7. **Planning Applications to be Determined**
Iarrtasán Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh

In accordance with Standing Order 18, the Committee **AGREED** that items 7.1 – 7.4 be taken at this point of the meeting.

7.1 **Applicants:** Mr Niall McLean (17/01975/FUL) (PLS/054/18)

Location: Achara House, Duror, Appin, PA38 4BW. (Ward 21)

Nature of Development: Erection of extension and internal alterations.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/054/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application.

Mrs S Macmillan presented the report and recommendation.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission.

7.2 **Applicant:** Mr Niall McLean (17/01976/LBC) (PLS/055/18)

Location: Achara House, Duror, Appin, PA38 4BW. (Ward 21)

Nature of Development: Erection of extension and internal alterations (Listed Building Consent).

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/055/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Mrs S Macmillan presented the report and recommendation.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** listed building consent subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 7.3 **Applicant:** Mr David Matzdorf (17/05916/FUL) (PLS/056/18)
Location: Land North West of Coire Dubh, Glenfinnan. (Ward 11)
Nature of Development: Erection of house and formation of access.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/056/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Mrs S Macmillan presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:-

- A construction management plan had been included within the recommendation to ensure that construction traffic did not block the private access lane serving a number of other properties.
- The construction of the hard standing for the proposed house would allow room for turning of construction vehicles within the site and negate the need for vehicles to 'back up' the private access lane.
- The Flood Risk Management Team had initially objected due to concerns regarding a potential increase in the flow rate of water coming across the site from the culvert under the A830 trunk road at the top of the site and into a ditch beside the private access lane; however, this objection was subsequently withdrawn, subject to the inclusion of a condition within the recommendation requiring measures to be put in place to ensure that the water flow rate would not increase through this section.
- The Forestry Officer's objection remained outstanding; however, following discussion with Transport Scotland regarding the impact on trees along the main road side, the number of trees proposed for removal had been significantly reduced.
- It was proposed that an informative note be included within the recommendation to make clear the need for appropriate arrangements to be made by the developer, with the owner of the track and others with a legal interest in it, to ensure that any damage would be made good following construction work, and to contribute towards its future upkeep; however, as the access lane was privately owned, it was ultimately the responsibility of the owner of the track and those with the legal right to use it to ensure that this would be undertaken.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- Whilst acknowledging the concerns raised by local residents, the site was considered acceptable for the proposed development and the design was also considered to be of an acceptable standard.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 7.4 **Applicant:** Mr David Matzdorf (17/05917/FUL) (PLS/057/18)
Location: Land West of Sruth A' Mhuilinn, Glenfinnan. (Ward 11)
Nature of Development: Erection of house.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/057/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Mrs S Macmillan presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:-

- The front elevation of the proposed development was considered to be of sufficient distance from the nearest neighbouring house “The Cabin”.
- A condition had been included within the recommendation to secure boundary treatments and an adequate level of privacy to the occupants of The Cabin to mitigate any overlooking from the proposed development.
- The proposed drainage works would lead the surface water flow from one side of the private access lane to the other in order to prevent water from running down the private access lane onto the public road and dragging material onto it.

During discussion, Members’ comments included the following:-

- Whilst it was acknowledged that the Council could not enforce the recommendations of the informative note regarding maintenance of the private access lane, concern was expressed that the lack of a formal legal agreement could lead to protracted disputes between neighbouring properties.
- With reference to comment within the report stating that “it would be beneficial to develop this site in preference to another less sustainable location”, it was emphasised that the Committee should not be agreeing permission for planning applications on the basis that they were better or worse than another location and that each application should be dealt with on its own merits.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

6. Continued Item Cuspairean a' Leantainn

- 6.1 **Applicant:** Springfield Properties PLC (17/05667/FUL) (PLS/047/18)
Location: Land 123M SE of Rosebank, Kingsteps, Lochloy Road, Nairn. (Ward 18)
Nature of Development: Residential development and associated infrastructure.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been re-circulated Report No PLS/047/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

A site visit had taken place earlier that morning attended by the following Members: Mr R Balfour, Mr G Cruickshank, Mr L Fraser, Mr J Gray, Ms P Hadley, Mr T Heggie, Mr A Jarvie, Mr B Lobban, Mr R MacWilliam, Mr B Thompson, Mr D MacPherson (as an observer) and Mr P Saggars (as Local Member). Only those Members who had attended the site visit and were present at the meeting took part in the determination of the application.

Mr K McCorquodale presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:-

- Construction traffic into the site from the A96(T) road would use the existing access via Montgomerie Drive and through Averon Street, making use of the existing roads serving the Meadowlea area, and would not be permitted to access the site from Kingsteps.
- Developer contributions from developments at Lochloy towards a pedestrian and cycle bridge across the Inverness to Aberdeen railway were estimated to be in the region of around £2k per house; however, the design and location of the proposed bridge had not yet been confirmed.
- There was a degree of topography within the application site and the water course had cut an incision in the landscape; therefore, the cutting of the embankment of the river had risen over time.
- Water catchment further upstream from the application site was not considered significant as it extended around 5-6 kilometres further back from the site and proceeded through a relatively flat agricultural plain with ample agricultural drainage which had been directed through water courses and ditches in this area.
- The Flood Risk Management Team was satisfied that the proposed development would not be at risk of flooding from the watercourse running through the site during a 1:200 year (plus 30% allowance for climate change) fluvial flood event.
- The transport assessment submitted by the applicant's agent included two analyses of the potential trips which the proposed development was likely to generate and included manual road traffic surveys at the junctions from Montgomery Drive and from Suters Way onto Lochloy Road.
- The information collated from the road traffic surveys was compared against vehicular movements during peak periods from existing housing developments in the area to produce an assessment of the anticipated trips that would be generated from the remainder of development currently being built, but not yet occupied, and also the proposed development contained within the application.
- The final analysis of the transport assessment was based on industry software which was used as a comparison with the information collated from the road traffic surveys and had produced more onerous vehicle trip generations than the actual traffic surveys.
- The Highland-wide Local Development Plan 2012 HWLDP identified a number of areas within Nairn either allocated for development or as land with amenity and recreational value and also identified the boundary of the Nairn settlement area, which included Kingsteps.
- Clarification was provided on the use of the terms "grey land" and "green land" development within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP), during which it was explained that grey areas of land were within the settlement boundary where there was potential for development and green areas of land were protected from development.

- Whilst the report recognised that there was evidence of an active clan of badgers within the wider area, it was confirmed that there were currently no active badger setts within the area to be developed within the application site. This excluded the area around the existing watercourse.
- Should any badger setts be identified prior to and during construction, the applicant would be required to obtain a species license from Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) in order to move these into the wider countryside and to provide appropriate mitigation.
- The projected capacity for this site, as allocated within the IMFLDP, was 90 houses.
- The figures contained within the road traffic assessment were based on the projected number of vehicular movements that would be created from the proposed development.
- The survey of current vehicular movements had been undertaken during the peak traffic times of between 07:00 – 10:00 and 16:00 – 19:00.
- The land proposed for development and which lay outwith the allocated housing site had been identified as grey land within the IMFLDP and therefore as land with potential for development.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- Concern was expressed that the capacity of Lochloy Road was insufficient to deal with the potential extra traffic generated by the proposed development.
- Concern was also expressed that the traffic lights and junction at Lochloy Road were incapable of dispersing existing traffic quickly enough to permit the freeflow of vehicles along the A96(T) road and that it was not uncommon for traffic from Inverness to be backed up through the whole of Nairn town centre.
- The road to the east of Nairn was single track at Kingsteps and was not suitable for general vehicle use.
- It was suggested that a bigger buffer-space was required between the proposed development and the existing housing development at Kingsteps.
- The entire Kingsteps site represented an over-development in houses.
- Some areas of Nairn suffered from low-water pressure during peak usage times and concern was expressed that the proposed development would further exacerbate this problem.
- In highlighting concerns with the current sewage system and the capacity of the sewage station, concern was expressed that these issues could be increased with the proposed development.
- It was highlighted that raw sewage continued to be forced directly into the River Nairn during heavy rainfall.
- It was suggested that further housing should not be built until a new bridge crossing from the A96 to the estate was in place.
- The current level of demand for affordable housing was questionable as around 950 affordable houses and flats had been built within Nairn over the previous 30 years.
- In acknowledging the concerns raised regarding development on Lochloy Road, it was highlighted that police opinion was that Lochloy Junction was not considered dangerous.
- Mitigation measures recommended within the report to deal with speeding on Lochloy Road were welcomed.
- In acknowledging the concerns raised regarding water pressure and waste water in Nairn, it was suggested that Local Members and the Council needed

to emphasise to Scottish Water these issues if further development was to take place in Nairn.

- Whilst the future development of the A96(T) bypass was welcomed, concern was expressed that, unless current issues regarding infrastructure were dealt with, the bypass could be further delayed until the appropriate infrastructure was in place.
- The lack of affordable housing in Nairn was emphasised.
- Concern was expressed regarding the results of the road traffic survey and that it may have failed to accurately show the potential impact from the proposed development.
- Unnecessary grievance had been caused within the community due to the zoning of the whole of Nairn as an area for housing development and that a balance needed to be struck between identifying the whole of Nairn for housing development and the separate communities located within Nairn
- The creation of a buffer zone could alleviate some of the concerns raised regarding the proximity of the proposed development to the existing community at Kingsteps.
- There was a need for housing within Nairn and the proposals represented good development.
- It was highlighted that the main problem with traffic flow in Nairn was due to the A96(T) road and that this could be alleviated in the future with the development of a bypass.

No consensus having been reached between the members, the Chairman, seconded by Mr B Lobban, then moved a motion that the application be granted subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

Mr L Fraser, seconded by Mr A Jarvie, then moved as an amendment that the application be refused on the grounds that:

- Notwithstanding the traffic impact assessment, Mr Fraser was not convinced that the traffic that this development will generate will not exacerbate the current delays along Lochloy Road at the junction leading onto the A96(T) road, and consequently considered that this application is contrary to policy 2 of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan in so far as it fails to provide the necessary infrastructure required to support the development.
- The houses on the area of land outwith the NA2 allocation boundary were unacceptable by reason of insufficient separation between the houses at Kingsteps and the new proposed development, and the development was therefore contrary to policy 28 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan by reason of unacceptable impact on individual and community residential amenity.

On a vote being taken, five votes were cast in favour of the motion and five votes in favour of the amendment, with no abstentions as follows:-

Motion

Mr J Gray
Mr T Heggie
Mr B Lobban
Mr R MacWilliam
Mr B Thompson

Amendment

Mr R Balfour
Mr G Cruickshank
Mr L Fraser
Ms P Hadley
Mr A Jarvie

There being an equality in votes, the Chairman exercised his casting vote in favour of the **MOTION**, which was therefore carried and the Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission.

7. Planning Applications to be Determined (continued) **Iarrtasan Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh**

7.5 **Applicant:** Mr Sean Kelly (18/00852/PIP) (PLS/058/18)

Location: Land 220M West of 8 Cradlehall Court, Cradlehall, Inverness. (Ward 19)

Nature of Development: Development of commercial units, formation of access.

Recommendation: Refuse.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/058/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the refusal of the application on the grounds as detailed in the report.

Mr K McCorquodale presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:-

- It was the planning officer's view that the design and arrangement of the proposed development lacked integration with the existing local neighbourhood centre.
- The use of the strip of land between the existing neighbourhood centre and the development site, to create better integration with the existing neighbourhood centre, would have been welcomed; however, the application did not set out any proposals to achieve this.
- Information provided at the meeting by the local member regarding ownership of the "ransom" strip by Cradlehall, Westhill Community Council and the speed of traffic on Caulfield Road would have been welcomed when the application had been submitted; however, as this information was not provided by the applicant or consultees, the planning officer could not use it in his assessment of the application.
- The 20mph speed restriction signs on Caulfield Road only flashed during school opening and closing times.
- The applicant had undertaken speed surveys which indicated that 85% of vehicular movements were either at or below the speed limit heading north in the direction of the proposed entrance to the application site.
- The application was for planning in principle; therefore, a full application would be required in due course should permission be granted.
- A range of traffic calming measures could be included as a condition within planning permission.
- Transport Planning had not raised any objection; however, there was a need to include a package of measures to mitigate concerns regarding the spacing of the proposed junction with other junctions in the area.

- Activity regarding the removal of recycling bins at the adjacent neighbourhood centre was not relevant to this application.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- The potential use of the commercial unit as a pharmacy was highlighted.
- Whilst the preference was for the access road to the proposed commercial unit to come from the existing local neighbourhood centre, the proposed separate junction was a suitable compromise.
- The application presented an opportunity to improve road traffic safety and management on Caulfield Road.
- Precedent had been set by developments in the surrounding area which had roads going through a buffer zone as opposed to where the ransom strip was located.
- Given the expansion of the Cradlehall area with new housing and also a care home being built, the need for further commercial units in Cradlehall was emphasised.
- There would be merit in an application that proposed an access to the commercial unit through the "ransom" strip.

In response to further questions raised during discussion, it was confirmed that the application was for planning in principle and set out within a red-line boundary an application for potential use of commercial units with road access from Caulfield Road. In response to comment regarding the potential use of one of the units as a pharmacy, it was explained that no defined use of the units had been proposed within the application and that the issues raised in the report were in relation to the integration of the existing land with the existing local neighbourhood centre and how best this could be achieved.

Following a brief adjournment to seek officers' advice, the Chairman, seconded by Mr B Lobban, then moved that the application be refused for the reasons recommended in the report.

Mr A Jarvie confirmed that whilst there wasn't anything in the application itself to state in planning terms that he was happy with, he would welcome submission of the proposed development as a full application, knowing that there was the demand and desire for it within the community.

The Committee thereafter agreed to **REFUSE** planning permission on the grounds recommended in the report.

7.6 **Applicant:** Mr Richard Howie (17/01652/FUL) (PLS/059/18)

Location: Land South of Craigellachie Cottage, Wester Galcantray, Cawdor. (Ward 18)

Nature of Development: Erection of house and self-contained living accommodation.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/059/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Mr D Mudie presented the report and recommendation.

During discussion, it was acknowledged that flooding had previously occurred within the area; however, this was attributed to problems with drainage on the road to the north of the application site and it was considered that any recurrence of this was unlikely to impact on Craigellachie Cottage. Therefore, it was considered that the conditions recommended within the report, which included the installation of foul water and surface water drainage prior to commencement of development within the site, would address any concerns regarding potential flooding.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 7.7 **Applicant:** Mr Timothy Allan (17/01255/FUL) (PLS/060/18)
Location: 4 Mill View, Tomatin, Inverness. (Ward 19)
Nature of Development: Erection of Garden shed (Retrospective).
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/060/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application.

Mr J Kelly presented the report and recommendation.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission.

8. Decision on Appeal to the Scottish Government Directorate for Planning and Environmental Appeals
Co-dhùnaidhean Ath-thagraidhean do Bhuidheann-stiùiridh Riaghaltas na h-Alba airson Ath-thagraidhean Dealbhaidh agus Àrainneachd

- 8.1 **Applicant:** Mrs Catherine Brown (PPA-270-2189) (17/03503/FUL)
Location: 67 Tomnahurich Street, Inverness, IV3 5DT. (Ward 13)
Nature of Appeal: Change of use of shop to Class 3(5) Chinese hot food takeaway.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that it would be for local residents to report to the Council any failure by the applicant to comply with Condition 5 and that any allegations of breach of this condition could be investigated.

The Committee **NOTED** the decision of the Reporter to allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to the 6 conditions listed at the end of the decision notice.

- 8.2 **Applicant:** Mrs Catherine Brown (PPA-270-2189) (17/03503/FUL)
Location: 67 Tomnahurich Street, Inverness, IV3 5DT. (Ward 13)
Nature of Appeal: Change of use of shop to Class 3(5) Chinese hot food takeaway.

The Committee **NOTED** the decision of the Reporter to dismiss the appeal and refuse planning permission.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

The Highland Council

North Planning Applications Committee

Minute of the meeting of the North Planning Applications Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Tuesday 11 September 2018 at 10.30 am.

Committee Members Present:

Mr R Bremner (excluding items 1 – 5), Mrs I Campbell, Mr C Fraser (excluding item 6.1), Mr R Gale (excluding items 1 – 7.1), Mr D MacKay, Mrs A MacLean (excluding items 1 – 6.1), Mr D Macleod (excluding item 7.1), Mrs M Paterson, Mr A Rhind (excluding item 7.3 – 8.1), Mr K Rosie, Mr A Sinclair and Ms M Smith.

Officials in attendance:

Mr D Jones, Area Planning Manager North
Ms J Bridge, Senior Engineer (Development Management)
Mrs R Hindson, Planner
Ms G Webster, Planner
Mrs K Lyons, Principal Solicitor – Planning and Clerk
Mrs A MacArthur, Administrative Assistant

Business

Ms Maxine Smith in the Chair

The Chair confirmed that the meeting would be filmed and broadcast over the Internet on the Highland Council website and would be archived and available for viewing for 12 months.

1. Apologies

Leisgeulan

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Ms K Currie, Mr M Finlayson and Mr C MacLeod.

2. Declarations of Interest Foillseachaidhean Com-pàirt

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Confirmation of Minutes Dearbhadh a' Gheàrr-chunntais

There had been submitted for confirmation as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 1 August 2018 which was **APPROVED**.

4. **Major Development Update Iarrtasan Mòra**

There had been circulated Report No PLN/054/18 by the Head of Planning and Environment providing an update on progress of all cases within the “Major” development category currently with the Planning and Development Service for determination.

The Planning Officer and Principal Solicitor responded to Members’ questions as follows:

- the appeal on the Golticlay Wind Farm application was progressing, the lodging date for hearing statements and documents was yesterday, the 10 September 2018, and the inquiry itself is due to start on the 8 October 2018; and
- information was still awaited from the developer on the application for 72 residential units in Conon, this application would be brought to Committee when the information had been received.

The Committee **NOTED** the current position with these applications.

5. **Major Developments – Pre-application consultations Leasachaidhean Mòra – Co-chomhairle Ro-iarrtais**

5.1 Description: Formation of wind farm comprising approximately 12 turbines, associated tracks, substation and compound, crane pads, borrow pit, meteorological mast and temporary construction compound (18/040000/PAN) (PLN/055/18)

Ward: 1

Applicant: EnergieKontor UK Ltd

Site Address: Lairg Wind Farm, Lairg.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/055/18 by the Area Planning Manager on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted no material planning considerations they wished brought to the applicant’s attention other than those identified in the report.

6. Continued Items Cuspairean a' Leantainn

6.1 Applicant: Mr Magnus Beveridge (17/04250/FUL) (PLN/056/18)
(PLN/012/18)

Location: Land 75M SE Of Shamba, 151 Skinnet, Talmine, Tongue (Ward 1)

Nature of Development: Installation of 4 bothies, upgrade of access and installation of septic tank and soakaway.

Recommendation: Refuse.

Only Members taking part in the previous meeting on 6 March 2018 could take part in this item, namely, Mr R Bremner, Ms I Campbell, Mr D MacKay, Mr Derek MacLeod, Mrs Margaret Paterson, Mr A Rhind, Mr K Rosie, Mr A Sinclair and Ms M Smith.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/056/18 and the previous report PLN/012/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee refuse the application for the reasons stated in the report. This item had been deferred at the meeting on 6 March 2018 to allow the Planning Service and the applicant to discuss either a re-design of the proposal or to move the proposal to the landward side of the road.

The Planning Officer stated that following discussion with the applicant:

- no other land was available to the applicant to relocate the development;
- the road issues had been resolved and therefore the second reason for refusal, in the original report, had been removed; and
- the siting of the four bothies was still the main concern of the planning service.

The Planning Officer responded to Members' questions as follows:

- the other building on the seaward side of the road was an agricultural shed;
- national scenic areas have key characteristics with most of this designation relating to open views. Scottish Natural Heritage would not comment on this application as this was a small scale development that had not met the threshold; and
- Transport Planning had initially been unable to comment on any road issues due to a lack of information, this information had now been provided and the developer had satisfied the Transport Planning requirements. Transport Planning had thereafter advised that they had no road issues, albeit road conditions would be attached to any planning consent;

Ms M Smith, seconded by Mr R Bremner **moved** the recommendation to refuse the application.

There being no amendment, the Committee agreed to **REFUSE** in accordance with Reason 1 in the report.

7. Planning Applications to be Determined Iarrtasán Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh

7.1 Applicant: Mr I Barnes (18/00385/FUL) (PLN/057/18)

Location: Land 70m NW of Seaview, 178 Armadale, Sutherland (Ward 1).

Nature of Development: Siting of a residential static caravan with composting toilet; installation of surface/grey water soakaway, siting of temporary storage containers; partial change of use of land to accommodate two Yurts for temporary seasonal accommodation.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/057/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report. The Area Planning Manager advised that there had been the formation of a platform area for the original position of the yurts.

The Planning Officer and Senior Roads Engineer responded to Members' questions as follows:

- the road through the development site leads to a property not owned by the developer, this road is an adopted road;
- a condition requiring the removal of the gate could not be applied as the removal of the gate would come under roads legislation, the Senior Roads Engineer confirmed that Community Services had served notice on the applicant to have the gates removed;
- the number of tyres appeared excessive, the tyres would be used for holding down polythene on top of silage bales, conditions would be added to any planning permission for the removal of any unused tyres;
- a caravan would normally be allowed whilst a house was under construction with temporary planning permission lasting for 2 years, therefore any permission would be limited to the 15 September 2020;
- the composting toilet came under Building Standards legislation and similar composting toilets were in operation elsewhere;
- the Committee could ask for the reinstatement of the platform area, the applicant had said that the area would give shelter to livestock that would eventually come to the site; and
- the applicant should have spoken to the Planning Service before commencing any work but once he had realised he should have planning permission he had stopped the works immediately.

Ms M Smith, seconded by Mr R Bremner **moved** deferral of the application for:

- (i) the submission of a plan indicating the sequential timescale for implementation of the various elements of the applicant's crofting enterprise;
- (ii) drone footage and/or photographs of the application site as seen in the context of the surrounding properties/landscape (failing which a site visit to be organised).

There being no amendment, the Committee agreed to **DEFER** consideration of the application to a future meeting of the committee for the reasons stated above.

7.2 Applicant: Mr Alexandar Campion (18/02744/FUL) (PLN/058/18)

Location: Land 90M SW Of Kinvara, Altass (Ward 1).

Nature of Development: Erection of 2 houses, formation of access and installation of private drainage.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/058/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

7.3 Applicant: Cromarty Estate with Cromarty and Resolis Film Society (CRFS) (18/03022/FUL) (PLN/059/18)

Location: Land 30M East Of Slaughterhouse Café, Cromarty (Ward 9).

Nature of Development: Erection of cinema and office hub, formation of courtyard and parking area and change of use of amenity ground.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLN/059/18 by the Area Planning Manager recommending that the Committee grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

The Planning Officer and Senior Roads Engineer responded to Members' questions as follows:

- there would be 10 parking spaces with an additional disabled parking bay;
- the main walking area to the links would be maintained;
- there would be a seating capacity in the cinema of 30 to 35 people;
- the access road was private and the cinema would have limited hours and showings, the volume of ferry traffic was not significant and a request for work to the road would not be proportionate with the size of the development; and
- a feasibility study showed demand from small local businesses for the office space.

Members asked that it be stated that the Links is a significant amenity area enjoyed by locals and visitors alike, especially in the summer months. This links area, lying within the conservation area, needs to be safeguarded and protected.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

8. Decisions on Applications to the Scottish Government Directorate for Energy and Climate Change and Planning Appeals
Co-dhùnadh mu Iarrtas do Bhuidheann-stiùiridh Riaghaltas na h-Alba airson Lùth agus Atharrachadh Aimsir

8.1 Applicant: Peter Williamson (17/04356/FUL) (PPA-270-2193)

Location: Land 30 metres NW of Sgurr Alasdair, 10 Torrin, Broadford, Isle of Skye, IV49 9BA (Ward 10)

Nature of Development: Erection of house and shed.

The Committee **NOTED** the decision of the Reporter to approve the application for consent subject to the 5 conditions and 4 advisory notes listed at the end of the Decision Notice.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 12.45 pm.

The Highland Council South Planning Applications Committee

Minute of Meeting of the South Planning Applications Committee held in the Chamber, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Tuesday 18 September 2018 at 10.30 am.

Committee Members Present:

Mr R Balfour
Mr A Baxter (excluding items 6.8 – 6.10)
Mr B Boyd
Ms C Caddick
Mr G Cruickshank
Mrs M Davidson
Mr L Fraser
Mr J Gray
Ms P Hadley
Mr T Heggie
Mr A Jarvie
Mr R Laird (excluding items 1 - 6.2)
Mr B Lobban
Mr R MacWilliam
Mr N McLean (by video-conference)
Mr B Thompson

Non Committee Members Present:

Mr J Bruce (items 1 - 6.5 only)
Mrs T Robertson (items 1 – 6.4 only)

Officials in attendance:

Ms N Drummond, Area Planning Manager South/Major Developments
Mr D Mudie, Team Leader
Mr M Clough, Senior Engineer, Transport Planning
Mr K Gibson, Principal Planner
Mr S Hindson, Principal Planner
Mr K McCorquodale, Principal Planner
Ms J Bain, Planner
Mrs S Hadfield, Planner
Mr J Kelly, Planner
Ms C Millard, Planner
Miss C McArthur, Solicitor (Regulatory Services)
Mr S Taylor, Administrative Assistant

Mr J Gray in the Chair

Preliminaries

The Chairman confirmed that the meeting would be filmed and broadcast over the internet on the Highland Council website and would be archived and available for viewing for 12 months.

Business

1. Apologies for Absence Leisgeulan

None.

2. Declarations of Interest Foillseachaidhean Com-pàirt

None.

3. Confirmation of Minutes Dearbhadh a' Gheàrr-chunntais

There had been circulated for confirmation as a correct record the minute of the Committee meeting held on 8 August 2018 which was **APPROVED**.

4. Major Development Update Iarrtasan Mòra

There had been circulated Report No PLS/061/18 by the Head of Planning and Environment which provided a summary of all cases within the "Major" development category currently with the Planning and Development Service for determination.

In speaking to the report, the Team Leader confirmed that the application for the revised pumped storage scheme at Coire Glas, North Laggan (application reference 18/01564/S36) would be submitted for determination to the next meeting of the Committee on 23 October 2018. The Chair reminded Members that at the previous meeting of the Committee, it had been agreed that a site visit be held in relation to this application.

During discussion, concern was expressed that the next meeting of the Committee would take place during the school holidays. The Chair reminded Members that the decision to hold the meeting had previously been agreed by full Council in 2017 and therefore the meeting would proceed as scheduled.

Thereafter, the Committee **NOTED** the current position and **AGREED** that the site visit in relation to application reference 18/01564/S36 be held on the morning of Friday, 19 October 2018.

5. Major Developments – Pre-application consultations Leasachaidhean Mòra – Co-chomhairle Ro-iarrtais

5.1 **Description:** Erection of a phased development including distillery with all associated and necessary infrastructure, Visitor and retail facilities, staff and limited visitor accommodation, the development will also require information of a new access of the A95, improvement of existing access, roads and car parking (18/03491/PAN) (PLS/062/18).

Ward: 20 – Badenoch and Strathspey

Applicant: Speymalt Whisky Distributors Ltd

Site Address: Land 350m SE of Lower Gaich, Dulnain Bridge.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/062/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted the following material planning consideration they wished brought to the applicant's attention:-

- Consideration should be given to the visual impact of the development and any bearing the development would have on the proposed Strathspey Steam Railway crossing over the A95.

together with the other material considerations identified in the report.

5.2 **Description:** New development of up to 111 residential units with associated roads and services (18/03564/PAN) (PLS/063/18).

Ward: 19 – Inverness South

Applicant: DMPM Services Ltd

Site Address: Land 260M SE of Simpsons Garden Centre, Inshes, Inverness.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/063/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that, whilst it was likely that the proposed access into the site would be from the B9177, clarity on this would be provided once a detailed planning application had been received from the applicant.

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted the following material planning consideration they wished brought to the applicant's attention:-

- Consideration should be given to the access arrangements into the site and any impact on road safety given the current road layout and the speed of traffic traveling along Culloden Road.

together with the other material considerations identified in the report.

5.3 **Description:** Proposed Sand & Gravel Quarry (18/03732/PAN) (PLS/064/18).

Ward: 18 – Nairn and Cawdor

Applicant: Breedon Northern Ltd

Site Address: Land 575M SW of Upper Remore, Nairn.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/064/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted no further material planning considerations they wished brought to the applicant's attention other than those identified in the report.

5.4 **Description:** Construction of a residual waste management facility on the site of the former landfill (18/04128/PAN) (PLS/065/18).

Ward: 16 – Inverness Millburn

Applicant: The Highland Council

Site Address: Longman Landfill Site, Stadium Road, Inverness.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/065/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments on the submission of a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN), describing the site and setting out likely relevant policies and potential material planning considerations.

During discussion, it was requested that the Council's long term ambition to develop an energy from waste plant within the site should be included as part of consultation in regard to this proposed development. In response, it was confirmed that it was the Council's intention to produce a masterplan for the area and that it would take into account the future development of the site; however, this application would be assessed in isolation as a materials recovery facility. The Chair emphasised that there was a process to go through in relation to waste management and that the Council was not currently in a position to decide the best location for an energy from waste plant.

The Committee **NOTED** the submission of the PAN and highlighted no further material planning considerations they wished brought to the applicant's attention other than those identified in the report.

6. Planning Applications to be Determined Iarrtasan Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh

6.1 **Applicants:** Mr and Mrs I Wilson (18/03576/PIP) (PLS/066/18)

Location: Land 120m SW of 2 Bohenie, Roy Bridge. (Ward 11)

Nature of Development: Erection of house and formation of access (part retrospective).

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/066/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Ms C Millard presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that in relation to this application (18/03576/PIP) and the following two applications on the agenda (items 6.2 (18/03577/PIP) and 6.3 (18/03578/PIP) refer):-

- Spean Bridge, Roy Bridge and Achnacarry Community Councils had objected to the proposed developments;
- With regard to the previously permitted developments referred to within the planning history of the site, planning in principle had previously been granted without any objections; and
- Whilst Spean Bridge, Roy Bridge and Achnacarry Community Councils were not statutory consultees, the applications had been referred to Committee at the Area Planning Manager's discretion due to the comments received from these community councils.

During discussion, the view was expressed that the principle of development had already been established within this site and that whilst concerns had been raised regarding a lack of development of affordable housing within surrounding villages, this was a long term issue and the proposed development was therefore considered acceptable.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 6.2 **Applicant:** Mr and Mrs I Wilson (18/03577/PIP) (PLS/067/18)
Location: Land 80m SW of 2 Bohenie, Roy Bridge. (Ward 11)
Nature of Development: Erection of house and formation of access (part retrospective).
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/067/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Ms C Millard presented the report and recommendation.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 6.3 **Applicant:** Mr and Mrs I Wilson (18/03578/PIP) (PLS/068/18)
Location: Land SW of 2 Bohenie, Roy Bridge (Ward 11)
Nature of Development: Erection of house and formation of access (part retrospective).
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/068/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Ms C Millard presented the report and recommendation.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 6.4 **Applicant:** Mr Allan Henderson (18/03023/FUL) (PLS/069/18)
Location: Land 35M West of Sealladh Na Gleann, Culloden Moor, Inverness. (Ward 19)
Nature of Development: Erection of detached house and garage, formation of access and associated services.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/069/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Ms J Bain presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, the following was confirmed:-

- The application site was located within the Hinterland of Inverness and the Culloden Moor Conservation Area;
- When the outline planning permission for three plots had previously been granted in 2006, the site was located outwith the Culloden Moor Conservation Area; however, following a review in 2015, the Leanach crossroads housing group, in which the site sits, was subsequently brought within the Conservation Area;
- All of the traditional cottages within the Leanach crossroads housing group were of a rough cast white/off-white design;
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES) was satisfied with the white/off-white rough cast design proposed for the house;
- The ridge height of the proposed house was similar to that of the existing housing within the group.

During points of clarification, concern was expressed by Members regarding the process for publication of representations as there were a number of objections to the proposed development which had been listed within the appendix as having only been provided by way of an e-mail address and that there had been no indication as to whether these had been received from separate households. It was therefore suggested that where a representation had been received by e-mail requesting the redaction of their household address, this be indicated in the documentation in order to establish whether the representation was genuine. It was further suggested that when submitting a representation, failure to provide a contact household address should make the representation invalid. In response, the Chair advised that the concerns raised would be taken in to consideration in terms of the overall principle regarding validity of representations and could be reported back to the Committee at a later point.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- The principle of development had been well-established and the proposed house would infill a gap between the two existing dwellings;
- Concern was expressed regarding the design of the proposed house as it would be visible from the Culloden Battlefield Visitor Centre car park and it was suggested that the upper layer of glazing should be removed from the gable end to the North as this aspect was not in keeping with the existing houses;
- The proposed house would fit in with the traditional style of the existing housing group;
- Whilst concerns raised regarding the glazing on the gable end were acknowledged, the house would be of a single storey design and could be considered an enhancement of the settlement; and
- Permission had previously been granted for development within this site and the height of the proposed house was considered to be acceptable.

No consensus having been reached between the members, Ms C Caddick, seconded by the Chairman, then moved a motion that the application be granted subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

Mr A Jarvie, seconded by Mr R Laird, then moved as an amendment that the application be deferred to allow the applicant the opportunity to remove the upper layer of glazing from the gable end of the proposed development due to its

proximity and overbearing feature from the Culloden Battlefield Visitor Centre car park and that the application be dealt with under delegated powers following submission of a revised design.

On a vote being taken, thirteen votes were cast in favour of the motion and three votes in favour of the amendment, with no abstentions as follows:-

Motion

Mr R Balfour
Mr A Baxter
Mr B Boyd
Ms C Caddick
Mr G Cruickshank
Mrs M Davidson
Mr L Fraser
Mr J Gray
Ms P Hadley
Mr T Heggie
Mr B Lobban
Mr N McLean
Mr B Thompson

Amendment

Mr A Jarvie
Mr R Laird
Mr R MacWilliam

The motion to **GRANT** planning permission accordingly became the finding of the meeting.

6.5 **Applicant:** Forrest Developments Ltd (18/00906/FUL) (PLS/070/18)

Location: Sainsbury Supermarket, Nairn. (Ward 18)

Nature of Development: Erection of a Class 1 retail unit & a restaurant with drive-thru lane (Sui Generis) with associated parking & other ancillary works.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report No PLS/070/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report and subject to the prior conclusion of a s.75 legal agreement.

Mr K McCorquodale presented the report and recommendation, during which he advised of the following amendments to the recommendation:-

- the wording of Condition 1(b) to read as “food” rather than “convenience”; and
- three additional conditions being included for waste collection, play area fencing and control of noise as set out at paragraphs 8.29 and 8.40 respectively of the report.

In response to questions, the following was confirmed:-

- Information used to assess whether Nairn was a suitable town to have a retail unit operating on a 24 hour basis included whether there were any major businesses with employed staff that provided 24 hour services, such as a hospital, or whether there were any premises with extended licensing hours that operated within the town;
- Nairn was not deemed to be a community which had businesses, retail and licensed premises operating on a 24 hour basis and the assessment sought to be consistent with the opening and closing times of other business premises located within the town;
- In relation to the operational hours proposed for the drive thru restaurant, it was the impact on the residential amenity of the area that was being assessed by the Committee at this stage and that any proposed hours in relation to a late hours catering licence for the premises would be a matter for the Licensing Committee to consider at a later date should an application come forward;
- The report sought to provide guidance as to what operating hours could be considered appropriate in the context of the amenity of the surrounding community;
- This application followed on from the original planning permission for development on this site which was granted on appeal by the Reporter appointed by Scottish Ministers. The Reporter had included a condition restricting the hours of operation for the premises on the site given the proximity of residential properties and the potential for noise disturbance. It was therefore considered appropriate to restrict the hours of operation for the premises relative to this application.
- The applicant could seek to extend the opening hours of the business by submitting a Section 42 application to vary the terms of the condition so long as they provided justification as to why they deemed it appropriate to do so;
- Consultation with the Flood Risk Management Team and other planning officers had identified a known risk of flooding at Auldearn Burn; however, as there was currently a live permission already granted for a larger retail development on this site, the proposed management of surface water within the site had been deemed acceptable;
- In taking into consideration the previously granted permissions and the assessments which had been undertaken, it was unlikely that additional mitigation measures would be required within this site as surface water would be directed to the water main drainage provided by Scottish Water;
- It was considered reasonable to seek a Litter Management Plan from the operator of the restaurant to assist with the protection of local amenity and to ensure measures were being taken to educate customers on their habits in relation to the disposal of litter;
- The applicant was keen that restaurant staff assisted with clean-ups within the retail park to ensure that the impact of any litter did not accumulate;
- The operator of the restaurant had a responsibility to examine the choice of materials used in its packaging and the potential impact it could cause;
- The Council needed to act on the behaviour of people purchasing food from a specific premises and then disposing of it onto the side of the road by identifying where it had been purchased and asking the business to provide guidance to customers on how it should be responsibly disposed of;
- There were no risks anticipated to residential amenity regarding anti-social behaviour arising from the development of the proposed drive-thru restaurant;

- The Retail Impact Assessment undertaken by the applicant took into account the retail expenditure within both the catchment area of the proposed development and adjacent areas;
- The Retail Impact Assessment had considered that the proposed development would help to recover expenditure which was currently being spent outwith the area and encourage shoppers to spend locally;
- It was proposed that only the Class 1 retail unit would have permission to sell convenience or comparison goods;
- A figure of £60,000 had been estimated by an engineer as the potential cost to the Council of improvement works to the footpath on Tom Semple Road and it was considered that a sum of £30,000 seemed a reasonable developer contribution towards the current application, given that there may be future developments within the vicinity who could also contribute towards the improvement works;
- The statement contained within the report at paragraph 8.13 “Elements of these conditions and enforceability are difficult to interpret” was in reference to Condition 3 within the recommendation;
- The £250,000 developer contribution from the initial retail application had been secured in relation to the whole site; and
- The proposed site layout did not contain sufficient land to be able to accommodate trees to act as screening.

During discussion, Members’ comments included the following:-

- It was highlighted that littering was a problem across the wider area of Nairn, in particular the harbour area;
- With regard to the Retail Impact Assessment, it was emphasised that Nairn high street should not be treated as an independent operation and that it should be treated as part of a holistic shopping experience;
- In highlighting the leakage of expenditure out of Nairn which had been identified within the Retail Impact Assessment, the proposed retail development offered positive choices for people within Nairn and it was considered that the proposed restaurant was the type of business that would be popular with younger people;
- The Community Council had undertaken a survey which had identified significant support for the proposed development from respondents;
- In highlighting the development of Nairn, BID and the businesses on Nairn High Street would have to identify creative ways to improve choice it was emphasised that the proposed development could provide an alternative option for shoppers within Nairn;
- Concern was expressed regarding potential flooding from Auldearn Burn into Balmakeith Drive due to its proximity to the existing supermarket and the proposed retail unit;
- The proposed development would offer free parking and it was suggested that, in light of the introduction of parking charges within Nairn Town Centre, there was potential for charging within the car park serving the development;
- More screening of the site would have been welcomed and it was suggested that if trees were unsuitable then bushes could be used as an alternative;
- It was emphasised that there was potential for a bridge across the railway linking to Balmakeith Industrial Estate;
- It was suggested that a review of the Town Centre First policy should be undertaken;

- Concern was expressed as to whether the conditions within the recommendation regarding the acceptable uses of the proposed retail unit and restaurant would be enforceable;
- In light of the potential drop in visitor numbers to Nairn should the proposed by-pass of Nairn take place, destination shops such as those proposed would help to draw traffic into Nairn;
- Concern was expressed regarding the proposed restriction on opening hours of the drive thru restaurant as it was felt that there would be no impact on residential amenity and it was suggested that the restaurant should be permitted to open as a 24hour operation;
- Whilst it had been suggested by the planning officer that the operating hours of the proposed restaurant should be restricted, the view was expressed that the decision on the operation hours of the proposed restaurant was a commercial one and that it should be for the operator to decide;
- It was suggested that the applicant be asked to provide a developer contribution for the full £60,000 estimate as a contribution towards active travel;
- Concern was expressed that extending the operating hours of the proposed drive thru restaurant could have a negative impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential area at night;
- The amount of litter produced by drive thru restaurants in other areas such as Fort William was emphasised;
- Taking into account the comments raised regarding litter and waste generated by similar developments, it was emphasised that a wider discussion was required on this issue; and
- It was requested that the Litter Management Plan set out in Condition 9 should be effective and proactive by taking into account the potential litter from a drive thru within the wider area (including the A96 Trunk Road) and not just through public education by displaying posters within the restaurant.

No consensus having been reached between the members regarding the operating hours of the drive thru restaurant, Mr A Baxter, seconded by Mr B Lobban, then moved a motion that the restriction in operating hours be removed from Condition 3.

Mr T Heggie, seconded by Mr L Fraser, then moved as an amendment that the operating hours of the “drive thru” restaurant as outlined in Condition 3 be retained.

On a vote being taken, five votes were cast in favour of the motion and eight votes in favour of the amendment, with three abstentions as follows:-

Motion

Mr A Baxter
 Mr B Boyd
 Ms C Caddick
 Mr A Jarvie
 Mr B Lobban

Amendment

Mr R Balfour
 Mrs M Davidson

Mr L Fraser
Mr J Gray
Ms P Hadley
Mr T Heggie
Mr R MacWilliam
Mr B Thompson

Abstention

Mr G Cruickshank
Mr R Laird
Mr N McLean

The amendment to retain the operating hours of the drive-thru restaurant as outlined in Condition 3 was **AGREED**.

There then followed a vote as to whether to defer the application or approve the recommendation and Mr R MacWilliam, seconded by Mr N McLean, moved a motion that the application be deferred to allow further discussions with applicant on increasing the developer contributions from £30,000 to £60,000..

Mr T Heggie, seconded by Mr L Fraser, moved as an amendment that the application be granted subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

On a vote being taken, eight votes were cast in favour of the motion and eight votes in favour of the amendment, with no abstentions as follows:-

Motion

Mr R Balfour
Mr A Baxter
Mr B Boyd
Mr G Cruickshank
Ms P Hadley
Mr R Laird
Mr R MacWilliam
Mr N McLean

Amendment

Ms C Caddick
Mrs M Davidson
Mr L Fraser
Mr J Gray
Mr T Heggie
Mr A Jarvie
Mr B Lobban
Mr B Thompson

There being an equality in votes, the Chairman exercised his casting vote in favour of the **AMENDMENT**, which was therefore carried and the Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to the prior conclusion of a s.75 legal agreement to secure a developer contribution of £30,000 towards Active Travel to be used for improving approximately 240 metres of footpath on Tom

Semple Road within Balmakeith industrial estate as set out at paragraphs 8.35 and 8.43 of the report, and the following:-

- the wording of Condition 1(b) to read as “food” rather than “convenience”; and
- three additional conditions being included for waste collection, play area fencing and control of noise as set out at paragraphs 8.29 and 8.40 respectively of the report.

6.6 **Applicant:** The Highland Council (18/03272/FUL) (PLS/071/18)

Location: Land between Dores Road and Torvean, Dores Road, Inverness. (Ward 13)

Nature of Development: Amended Design for Inverness West Link Stage 2 - construction of roundabout with new single carriageway road and swing bridge connection to Queens Park Roundabout, bridge control building, vehicular access to Caledonian Canal and realignments of General Booth Road and A82 plus provision of car park, associated in-canal infrastructure, drainage, earthworks, fencing, landscaping, new access tracks/paths, street lighting etc.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/071/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Mr S Hindson presented the report and recommendation, during which he advised of an amendment to the wording of Condition 27 to reflect the requirements of Transport Scotland in relation to the finish on the bridge parapets and confirmed that this was non-material and did not affect the overall position of the other conditions within the recommendation.

In response to questions, the following was confirmed:-

- In addition to the statutory consultees, discussion had taken place between the applicant’s project design unit and Inverness Rowing Club regarding access to the canal from both sides of the bank and that this had been facilitated within the application;
- Access from Torvean Roundabout to the turning head into the car park would be through a standard single carriageway and access beyond this point to the canal would be on a track of slightly greater width than a single lane;
- A swept path analysis had been undertaken which had demonstrated that the track from the car park to the canal would be of sufficient width to enable access to both vehicles and boats on trailers a;
- The concerns raised by Inverness Rowing Club regarding access to its clubhouse during construction hours could be dealt with within the Construction Management Plan;
- It was envisioned that a representative from Inverness Rowing Club could be included on the proposed Community Liaison Group;
- The Council’s Access Officer and the applicant’s project design unit were currently in disagreement regarding the use or otherwise of bound paths within the development and it had been proposed that clarification on the type, construction and finish of all paths proposed within the development be provided within the Access Management Plan under Condition 21(vi) of the recommendation;

- Condition 2 of the recommendation sought to ensure that Torvean Golf Course would be a fully operational 18 hole golf course and available at all times both during and after the construction of this stage of the road;
- Following discussion with Transport Planning, it was considered that the original proposal to have a bus stop between the two swing bridges would be inappropriate and it was now proposed that two new bus stops be located on General Booth road in addition to the existing bus stop to the North East of the proposed Torvean Roundabout; and
- In response to concern raised regarding the treatment of unbound paths in housing developments within the area which had been formed of hard packed gravel rather than tarmac, it was confirmed that the applicant's project design unit had held talks with the Access Panel regarding the materials to be used in construction of the paths and the planning officer would continue to discuss this with the Access officer in terms of the proposed Access Management Plan.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- In thanking the planning service for the active consultation which had been undertaken with local Members and the public, the benefits to the local area arising from Phase 1 of the Inverness West Link, including the proposed parkland, were highlighted;
- It was requested that clarity be provided to the local Member on the retention of crossing provision for pedestrians over the A82;
- Concern was expressed that the size of the proposed car park would be insufficient to cope with the potential demand arising from outdoor activities within the surrounding area such as the proposed parkland and it was suggested that provision should be made for areas outwith Inverness city centre to have increased car parking; and
- It was requested that Condition 21(vi) of the recommendation be amended to ensure that bound paving would be used rather than unbound paving for all paths proposed within the development.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report together with an amendment to Condition 21(vi) to ensure bound paving is used rather than unbound paving for all paths proposed within the development.

- 6.7 **Applicant:** Vastint Hospitality B.V. (18/01248/FUL) (PLS/072/18)
Location: Former Swimming Pool Site, Glebe Street, Inverness. (Ward 14)
Nature of Development: Erection of hotel development with associated landscaping, car parking & ancillary uses.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/072/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the reports.

Mr D Mudie presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, the following was confirmed:-

- The original Traffic Management Plan proposed for the site had sought to encourage traffic flow from Waterloo Place and Chapel Street into Glebe Street and for vehicles to manoeuvre at the front of the building;
- The Road Traffic Management Team had expressed concern that the creation of a dedicated right turn lane at the junction between Waterloo Place and Chapel Street into Glebe Street could require the removal of two traffic lanes running into Inverness City Centre and could subsequently have a knock-on impact on traffic queuing at Shore Street Roundabout;
- Whilst the proposed traffic route to the site from Academy Street via Friar's Street would not prevent vehicles turning right at the junction into Glebe Street, it could provide a means of helping the facility to direct traffic towards the hotel and relieve pressure on the junction;
- The Inverness Design Review Panel had endorsed the view that a building of scale was required within this location given its location adjacent to the A82/Friar's Bridge;
- The cost to the applicant of the materials used for the external cladding was considered relevant as the building would be viewed from 360 degrees and from different elevations; therefore, the materials used would have to be consistent around the whole building;
- The external cladding material proposed to be used on the building was considered appropriate within this setting and could also help to resolve the cost issues which had been identified;
- The design of the proposed development did not represent a significant departure from the previously granted residential development which itself had been a product of the previous version of the City Centre Development Brief;
- The proposed Traffic Management Plan sought to discourage traffic turning right from Waterloo Place and Chapel Street into Glebe Street in order to prevent potential conflict with traffic flow at the junction and that one of the measures to address this could be through the installation of additional signage;
- The projecting aluminium fin features were an architectural detail which highlighted the depth of the surrounding window openings;
- The roof terraces had been designed to reflect the length of the corridors within the building and to respect the scale of the building;
- The creation of the roof terraces would provide a setback for the east-west block of the building and also provide an opportunity for additional outdoor guest space;
- No changes were proposed to the existing road alignment and residential parking on Glebe Street;
- Given the market-base of the proposed hotel, it was not anticipated that the hotel would generate significant numbers of people arriving by coach and that the majority of customers would arrive either on foot or by taxi;
- It was anticipated that a large coach would be able to fit into the proposed drop off area at the front of the hotel on Glebe Street; and
- Whilst the Inverness Design Review Panel might not have provided a clear consensus on what could be considered an acceptable design, the proposal had taken into consideration the response provided by the Panel and the previously granted residential development.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- Concern was expressed that the proposed Traffic Management Plan would not work in practice as it was likely to increase the amount of traffic turning right from Waterloo Place and would also increase traffic into the already congested Academy Street/Chapel Street five lane junction as well as Friar's Street;
- Concern was expressed that whilst the proposed design of the building had been described as contemporary, the visualisations showed a building that was similar to that of the former Inverness College which had been built in the 1960s;
- The arrangement of the windows and massing of the proposed building were not considered appropriate for this type of development and it was emphasised that local Members were keen to avoid the use of large scale, grey box designs on buildings;
- Whilst the development of a hotel could be considered an appropriate use for the site, concern was expressed regarding the massing of the building to the north west side adjacent to Friar's Bridge;
- There was currently no site specific guidance for the application site under the Inverness City Centre Development Brief as there had been an assumption that the previously granted residential development would proceed;
- In referencing the Inverness Old Town Conservation Area Guidance, it was highlighted that the proposed development was within a conservation area and therefore, a high quality design which did not replicate previous mistakes should be sought;
- In comparison with the previously granted residential development, the changes to design were considered a step back in terms of the streetscape of Inverness along the riverside and the design of the proposed building was too similar to that of other buildings within Inverness which were deemed only suitable for demolition due to their appearance;
- Whilst the opportunity for development within what was considered to be an important site was welcomed, the proposed design was inappropriate as it resembled other examples of buildings within Inverness featuring grey concrete blocks which were no longer considered contemporary;
- The Council should not accept a design proposal on the grounds that the development might only be viable in terms of cost to the developer;
- Whilst there was a need for hotels of the scale proposed in the application within Inverness, concern was expressed that the proposed design had taken inspiration from nearby buildings such as the BT Tower and did not reflect the standard of design represented in the applicant's portfolio of buildings;
- Whilst the building would be predominantly made out of concrete, the proposed design did not look like Inverness College and reflected the type of design expected within a vibrant city centre;
- It was emphasised that the proposed development presented an opportunity for the creation of jobs through both its construction and its use as a hotel and could contribute towards the regeneration of Academy Street through an increase in potential customers;
- It was highlighted that a lighter external finish would be ineffective as pollution and dirt from cars passing over Friar's Bridge could turn the colour of the building grey;
- The proposed design was in keeping with the surrounding area;

- Whilst a hotel would be an appropriate use of this site and the proposed height of the block adjacent to Friar's Bridge was considered acceptable, the design of the building was not suitable for this site and an alternative proposal should be sought;
- Concern was expressed regarding the view of the proposed development from Ness Bridge and that the proposed building could be looked at for years to come in a similar way to that of the buildings on Upper Bridge Street which were currently earmarked for demolition;
- In highlighting examples of buildings constructed by the applicant in Britain and Europe, which were much more distinctive in appearance within their surrounding environment, it was suggested that the proposed design had been let down by the poor visuals provided by the applicant;
- Concern was expressed regarding the height of the building due to its proximity to the road when viewed on the approach to Glebe Street from the riverside;
- Whilst the external finish of the building might be considered appropriate in most city centres due to only the lower levels being visible, the whole structure of the proposed development would be visible from many areas of town and was in a prominent location beside the river;
- A more imaginative use of the roof terraces such as the provision of an outdoor area for guests such as a café or restaurant would have been welcomed;
- Concern was expressed that there would be a greater level of demand than was currently anticipated for coach parties using the hotel and therefore a suitable drop-off point was required to avoid traffic queuing on Glebe Street;
- Whilst there were no objections to the principle of a hotel being constructed within the site, it was acknowledged that concerns had been raised regarding the design of the proposed building and the potential impact on traffic; and
- The cost of redevelopment of the site should be a consideration in the planner's assessment of the proposed development.

No consensus having been reached between the members, the Chairman, seconded by Mr R MacWilliam, then moved a motion that the application be granted subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

Mr R Laird, seconded by Ms C Caddick, then moved as an amendment that the application be refused on the grounds that:-

- The proposed development was contrary to Policy 29 of the Highland wide Local Development Plan and the Inverness City Centre Development Brief as it failed to make a positive contribution to the architectural and visual quality of the place in which it was located due to the fact that the building was out of scale with the surrounding townscape, in particular the large mass of uniform height on the Friars Bridge elevation.

On a vote being taken, seven votes were cast in favour of the motion and eight votes in favour of the amendment, with one abstention as follows:-

Motion

Mr R Balfour
 Mr B Boyd
 Mr G Cruickshank
 Mr L Fraser

Mr J Gray
Mr T Heggie
Mr R MacWilliam

Amendment

Mr A Baxter
Ms C Caddick
Mrs M Davidson
Ms P Hadley
Mr A Jarvie
Mr R Laird
Mr B Lobban
Mr B Thompson

Abstention

Mr N McLean

The amendment to **REFUSE** planning permission accordingly became the finding of the meeting.

- 6.8 **Applicant:** Ms Kim Haywood (18/00296/FUL) (PLS/073/18)
Location: Land 205M NE of Lyne Cottage, Gorthleck. (Ward 12)
Nature of Development: Erection of house.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/073/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the reports.

Mr K Gibson presented the report and recommendation.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that the existing vehicular access to Purple Lodge was not tarred; however, this application presented an opportunity to upgrade the surface of the access.

During discussion, Members' comments included the following:-

- Whilst concerns which had been raised locally regarding the design of the proposed house were acknowledged, the proposed development was for a single house and the siting and design of the house was considered acceptable in the context of the adjacent Purple Lodge; and
- In regard to Condition 5 of the recommendation, it was requested that the existing vehicular access be brought up to the standards requested by Transport Planning prior to the commencement of development.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.

- 6.9 **Applicant:** Mrs Susan Cameron (17/05702/PIP) (PLS/074/18)
Location: Land 60M SW of 10 Easter Street, Caiplich, Kiltarlity. (Ward 12)
Nature of Development: Erection of house.
Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/074/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Mr K Gibson presented the report and recommendation.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that Kiltarlity Community Council had objected to the proposed development.

Comments raised during discussion included the following:-

- It was emphasised that whilst substantial development had taken place on the Street during the previous decade, this had brought the number of houses established on the Street up to a similar level that would have been there a century ago;
- Whilst the proposed house represented an infill of an existing housing group, it was important to ensure that further development would not take place when the limit for constructing within a housing group had been reached;
- It was requested that alterations to the passing place and the new access be undertaken prior to the commencement of development due to the narrowness of the road and poor drainage;
- It was further requested that discussions regarding a landscape plan be commenced as soon as possible to ensure the retention of trees along the road to act as screening; and
- Whilst supportive of the proposed development, concern was expressed regarding a lack of passing places near houses built on single track roads.

The Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report and subject to the following:-

- Condition 7 should be amended to a visibility splay of 2.4m x 60m; and
- Condition 8 should be amended to ensure that the existing passing place is upgraded prior to development of the house rather than prior to occupation of the house

6.10 **Applicant:** Mr Keiran Ferguson (18/02691/FUL) (PLS/075/18)

Location: Land 210m NW of Ancarraig Holiday Cottage Park, Bunloit, Drumnadrochit. (Ward 12)

Nature of Development: Erection of house and self-contained unit.

Recommendation: Grant.

There had been circulated Report Nos PLS/075/18 by the Area Planning Manager – South/Major Developments recommending the grant of the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the reports.

Mrs S Hadfield presented the report and recommendation.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:-

- Assurances had been received from the applicant that the one bedroom annex would be ancillary to the proposed dwelling and would not be a separate self-contained house;

- Whilst a number of planning consents had previously been granted on this site, only one of these had commenced (application reference: 13/00357/FUL);
- Given the location of the proposed development within the plot, it would only be physically possible to construct one of either the proposed development referred to in this application or the previously consented permission (application reference: 13/00357/FUL);
- The recommendations contained within the report in relation to protected species took into account the issues which had previously been raised within the previously consented permissions granted in 2013 (application reference: 13/00357/FUL) and 2017 (application reference: 17/00338/FUL); and
- The previously consented permission granted in 2007 (application reference: 13/00357/FUL) had been constructed.

Comments raised during discussion included the following:-

- Whilst there did not appear to be any reason to refuse the application, concern was expressed regarding the submission of multiple applications within the same site and it was requested that all prior planning permissions granted be checked to ensure that the applicant could only build one house; and
- It was requested that a restriction on the number of houses on the road between Bunloit and Ancarraig be implemented due to a number of bends and steep inclines going up this road.

In response to comments made during discussion, the Area Planning Manger confirmed the following:-

- all prior planning permissions granted could be checked to ensure the applicant could only build one house and that if this is not the case, the appropriate planning permissions could be revoked; and
- whilst not applicable to this application, the concerns raised regarding the number of houses located on the road between Bunloit and Ancarraig could be looked at and reported back to the local Member.

Thereafter, the Committee agreed to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report and subject to the following:-

- all prior planning permissions granted for this site are to be checked to ensure the applicant can only build one house. If this is not the case, the appropriate planning permissions are to be revoked

The meeting ended at 3.35 pm

Highland Council

Minutes of Meeting of the **Tourism Working Group** held in Committee Room 2, Council Headquarters, Inverness on Tuesday 14 August 2018 at 4.00 pm.

Present

Mr Bill Lobban (Chairman)
Mr Gordon Adam
Mr John Bruce
Dr Ian Cockburn

Mr Craig Fraser
Mr Allan Henderson
Mr Duncan Macpherson
Ms Maxine Smith

Officials in attendance

Mr C Simpson, Principal Tourism & Film Officer, Development & Infrastructure, Highland Council

Mrs L Dunn, Principal Administrator, Chief Executive's Service, Highland Council

MR B LOBBAN IN THE CHAIR

BUSINESS

1. Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was intimated on behalf of Mr J Gordon.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

There had been circulated Minutes of the last meeting held on 13 June 2018, the terms of which had been **APPROVED**.

4. Transient Visitor Levy (TVL)

The Working Group was invited to discuss the Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy document a copy of which had been circulated.

During discussion, the following main points were raised:-

- It was felt that the document that had been circulated was helpful guidance that could be used as a good basis to develop a similar brief for Highland;
- The importance of engagement and consultation with key stakeholders was emphasised but prior to this an information document was required to be prepared in a user-friendly format which explained the purpose of a TVL; outlined options in regard to how a TVL could be implemented and administered; indicated the revenue spend options and benefits; and also included a question and answer section that would collate qualitative responses;
- TVL's were widely operated across Europe, and tourists were both supportive and accustomed with the concept;

- The TVL would be paid for by tourists, i.e. not businesses, but the investment in infrastructure would be to the benefit of all in the Highlands;
- It was highlighted that tourists no longer had to pay credit card charges for travel and accommodation bookings and therefore this saving could be utilised towards payment of a TVL;
- Communication was key to ensuring smooth implementation of a TVL. It was critical that accurate information was disseminated to stakeholders, therefore it was recommended that a communication strategy should be developed in order to promote understanding of key messages and mitigate against misinformation. It was highlighted that there was an opportunity to raise the issue of implementation of a TVL at the forthcoming meeting of the Highland Tourism Partnership in early September 2018;
- It was suggested that the budget tool could be used as a method of demonstrating to the public the levels of income that could be generated from a TVL and the revenue spend options;
- It was essential that local authorities became more commercial to generate additional income and this would be an appropriate method which would enable investment in key infrastructure and assist in safeguarding in the provision of services;
- There was a need to lobby the Scottish Government to ensure that income generated from implementation of a TVL would be additional revenue and would not impact on the grant settlement;
- Once the public were fully informed and understood the benefits that could be reaped from investment in local facilities there would be community buy-in and public support for a TVL;
- Concern was expressed at how the TVL would be collected as not all tourist accommodation facilities were registered with VisitScotland. It was suggested that implementation could be through a phased approach, starting with hotels bringing in other types of accommodation thereafter;
- It was essential that income generated, or a proportion thereof, was ring-fenced to ensure that it would be invested in local infrastructure and maintaining facilities;
- It was highlighted that visitor accommodation was often booked considerably far in advance, therefore it was vital that implementation of a TVL had a significant lead in time to coincide with future bookings;
- With regard to cruise ships, it was highlighted that this was a growing industry and on this basis, it was recommended that this sector should be excluded from the TVL process at this stage in order to encourage development; and
- It was recommended that a report should be prepared and submitted to the next meeting of the Group. It was further recommended that the report would be an extensive research document and include liaison with internal Council services and other local authorities; outline options TVL models that could be adopted (including information on income generation levels and revenue spend options); provide examples and information on TVLs operated in other areas/countries; comprise details of concerns and challenges and how these could be overcome; and address common misconceptions. Thereafter, a final report would be prepared and submitted to full Council for approval of implementation of a TVL.

Following discussion, the Tourism Working Group **NOTED** the Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy document and **AGREED** that an in depth report comprising the aforementioned elements be submitted to the next meeting of the Group.

5. Any Other Business

- **Caravan Sites:** concern was expressed at the lack of provision of short term lets by caravan owners and it was suggested that this should be considered at a future meeting. This was **NOTED**; and
- **Date of Next Meeting:** It was requested that the next meeting, on 19 September 2018, be postponed to the following week and this was **AGREED**.

The meeting was closed at 4.45 pm.

Highland Council

Minutes of Meeting of the **Tourism Working Group** held in Committee Room 2, Council Headquarters, Inverness on Wednesday 26 September 2018 at 10.30 am.

Present

Mr Bill Lobban (Chairman)

Mr John Bruce

Mrs Muriel Cockburn (substitute)

Mr Allan Henderson (via teleconference)

Ms Maxine Smith

Officials in attendance

Mr A McCann, Economy & Regeneration Manager, Highland Council

Mr C Simpson, Principal Tourism & Film Officer, Development & Infrastructure, Highland Council

Ms L Joiner, Tourism Projects Co-ordinator, Development & Infrastructure, Highland Council

Mr M Kelly, Project Manager, Commercial & Efficiency Team, Corporate Resources Service

Mrs A Prior, Technical Business Analyst, Commercial & Efficiency Team, Corporate Resources Service

Mrs L Dunn, Principal Administrator, Chief Executive's Service, Highland Council

MR B LOBBAN IN THE CHAIR

BUSINESS

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr G Adam, Dr I Cockburn, Mr C Fraser, Mr J Gordon and Mr D Macpherson.

2. Declarations of Interest

The Working Group **NOTED** the following declaration of interest:-

Item 5 – Mr A Henderson (non-financial)

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

There had been circulated Minutes of the last meeting held on 14 August 2018, the terms of which had been **APPROVED**.

4. Rural Tourism Infrastructure Fund

The Tourism Projects Co-ordinator gave a verbal update on the Rural Tourism Infrastructure Fund during which she advised that the deadline for expressions of interest for the second round of funding were due to be submitted by 31 October 2018. She explained that expressions of interest would be submitted for a total of 17 projects and gave a brief synopsis of the purpose of each project. It was requested that a list of the projects be circulated to the Group. In addition, the Principal Tourism & Film Officer advised that he would provide an update on the outcome of the projects that had been submitted in respect of the first round of funding which was due at the start of next month.

During discussion it was suggested that consideration be given to charging coaches for parking at Suidhe Chuimein Viewpoint.

Thereafter, the Working Group **NOTED**:-

- i. the update and **APPROVED** the list of the expressions of interest to be submitted in regard to the second round of funding a copy of which would be circulated to the Group; and
- ii. that once received, an update would be circulated on the results of the first round of applications that had been submitted.

5. Transient Visitor Levy (TVL)

Declaration of Interest – Mr A Henderson declared non-financial interests in this item as a tourist accommodation provider, but having applied the test outlined in Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of the Councillors’ Code of Conduct, concluded that his interest did not preclude him from taking part in the discussion.

There had been circulated Report No TWG/07/18 dated 19 September 2018 by the Director of Development & Infrastructure. The report outlined a number of factors that would need to be considered in deciding whether or not to support the principle of a Transient Visitor Levy; explored some of the areas of detail that would require consideration; and concluded with reflections on some of the impacts a TVL might have.

During discussion, the following key points were raised:-

- In regard to implementation of a TVL it was highlighted that there could be a phased approach, e.g. commencing with hotels and extending to other types of accommodation thereafter. However, in contrast it was felt that having a sequential approach could influence tourist bookings which might lead to industry tension and it was therefore felt that implementation should be applied to all accommodation providers simultaneously to ensure equality;
- Concern was expressed at the suggestion of a TVL being applied to cruise ships. It was highlighted that this was a growing industry and there was a risk that application of a TVL to this sector could cause cruise ships to withdraw from the Highlands;
- Responding to the suggestion that the TVL should be extended to include coach tours, it was highlighted that many hotels also owned tour coaches and caution was expressed as to potential double charging;
- The need for a significant lead in time for implementation of a TVL was stressed;
- It was recommended that the Group should currently focus on the principle of implementation of a TVL and not get caught up in the detail of how such a scheme would be governed at this stage. There was a need to consult on the principle of a TVL ensuring that there was full awareness and understanding of the rationale and benefits (i.e. maintain infrastructure and enhance tourism) of such a scheme and seeking maximum engagement on this from the public as well as the tourist industry;
- It was felt that the income generated should not be ring-fenced. The view was expressed that the local public should be engaged and encouraged to give their views on how the additional income could be spent; and

- It was recommended that a report should be submitted to Council on 13 December 2018 seeking support of a TVL in principle and that a consultation be undertaken.

Following discussion, the Working Group:-

- NOTED** the range of factors that would need consideration in deciding whether or not to implement a TVL;
- NOTED** the possible impacts a TVL might have; and
- AGREED** that a report be submitted to the meeting of full Council on 13 December 2018 recommending support for implementation TVL and seeking agreement for a consultation in this regard to be undertaken.

6. Voluntary Visitor Levy

There was a presentation by the Commercial and Efficiency Team on the Voluntary Visitor Levy (VVL) during which the Working Group was advised that this initiative was currently being considered via the Commercial Board but in view of the links to tourism there was a need for a joined up approach. It was explained that there had been significant engagement with Edinburgh City Council both in terms of a TVL and VVL. The Project Manager concluded by explaining the potential scale of the scheme which included the projected level of income it could generate and outlined the options as to how it could be administered.

During discussion, the following main points were raised:-

- Clarification was sought and provided in regard to the level of yield that could be generated from a VVL as indicated in the presentation compared to that set out in paragraph 9.3 of the report for the previous item;
- It was queried whether it would be worthwhile investing and setting up a VVL scheme if this could be superseded by a TVL in the next few years however it was highlighted that it would be a valuable contingency option should a negative response on the TVL be received from the Scottish Government. In contrast, it was felt that in view of the current economic climate any opportunity to generate income should be exploited. In addition, it was suggested that implementation of VVL scheme could be a good foundation from which to transition to a TVL scheme;
- It was highlighted that the Cairngorm National Park Authority had previously considered a voluntary giving scheme but in comparing the operational costs of administering the scheme to the level of income being donated had concluded that that the financial gain was insufficient; and
- It was suggested that the report to Council on the TVL scheme should include a paragraph to apprise of the work being undertaken in regard to a VVL scheme as a contingency option.

Thereafter, the Working Group **NOTED** the presentation and **AGREED** that an additional paragraph be added to the TVL report to Council explaining that work was also ongoing in regard to the development of a VVL as a contingency measure.

7. **Any Other Business**

The Working Group **APPROVED** the following meeting dates for 2019:-

- Thursday 21 March 2019 at 10.30 am
- Thursday 6 June 2019 at 10.30 am
- Thursday 26 September 2019 at 10.30 am
- Thursday 28 November 2019 at 4.00 pm

The meeting was closed at 11.30 am.

The Highland Council

Minutes of Meeting of the **Waste Strategy Working Group** held in Committee Room 1, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Wednesday 19 September 2018 at 2.00 pm.

Present:-

Mr J Bruce	Mrs L MacDonald
Mr J Gray	Mrs T Robertson
Mr A Henderson (by tele-conferencing)	Mr G Ross

In attendance:-

Mr S Graham, Project Manager, Corporate Resource Service
Ms R Cleland, Corporate Communications Manager, Chief Executive's Service
Mr A Hume, Waste Management Officer (Strategy), Community Services
Ms I Percy-Bell, Waste Management Officer (Strategy), Community Services
Mr M Mitchell, Finance Manager, Finance Service
Ms F Povlsen, Media Assistant, Chief Executive's Service
Miss J MacLennan, Principal Administrator, Chief Executive's Service
Mrs C MacIver, Committee and Elections Officer, Chief Executive's Service

Preliminaries

In accordance with the video/tele-conferencing protocol, Mr Henderson was not permitted to Chair the meeting remotely. Mrs Robertson, having been duly proposed and seconded, took the Chair.

Business

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr I Cockburn, Mr H Morrison and Ms M Smith.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Progress Update on Waste Communications Strategy and Public Awareness Event

There had been circulated Report No WS/05/18 dated 18 September 2018 by the Director of Community Services.

The current version of the waste communications strategy was presented to Members and details of the preparations and content of the public awareness event were outlined. Members had previously identified effective communication if the Council's proposals, both in the medium and long term, were to be properly explained. Accordingly officers had drawn up a communications strategy with the aim of achieving a co-ordinated approach, not only for dealing with waste but also to encourage recycling and reuse of waste material. Graphics were provided of the content of display panels and

the context, purpose, key objectives, priorities, intended audiences, key messages and the channels through which the strategy could be directed were detailed. In addition, an easy to use fact sheet had been prepared.

During discussion, the following points were raised:-

- with all Highland schools having been awarded an Eco-School status, a series of visits to them was essential. In addition, it would be important to liaise with the Youth Convener, who may have resources available to assist, and the various Chambers of Commerce;
- while the message that landfill needed to be reduced was important, it was also vital to communicate the need to reduce the use of plastics and packaging etc. In this vein, there was merit in exploring the possibility of fast food outlets having wider responsibility for their litter in planning guidance or perhaps as a condition of any approval;
- the excessive use of product wrapping had to be addressed and perhaps Highland Council should take a lead in lobbying both Scottish and Westminster Governments and to encourage companies to review their approach. In this connection, the diagram showing the “Waste Journey” should not start at “home” but at the point of purchase;
- although more bins might encourage people to separate their waste, this was impractical in Highland given the infrastructure investment required;
- although improving the quality of recyclates could generate more income this market was particularly volatile;
- the impact of the charge for garden waste collection needed to be revisited to assess the income accrued against the tonnage generated and how best to promote the uptake of this collection service;
- possible sources of funding were suggested but, in response, it was pointed out that many of these were either for one-off initiatives or were no longer available;
- methods of reducing waste and promoting recycling were explored including a “Clean Highland” competition, akin to “Britain in Bloom” where communities competed to have the cleanest environment;
- careful attention needed to be paid as to where promotion and consultation events took place. Ideally this should be easily accessible to the public, i.e. the Eastgate Shopping Centre, but also throughout Highland; and
- to keep the issue alive and to give it the necessary prominence, progress should be reported to the next Environment, Development and Infrastructure Committee.

Thereafter, the Working Group:-

- i. **NOTED** the report;
- ii. **APPROVED** the focus, intent and composition of the waste communication strategy, taking into account the comments raised in discussion;
- iii. **AGREED** to look at how the garden waste collection could be promoted and;
- iv. **AGREED** to report progress to the Environment, Development and Infrastructure Committee.

4/5. Initial Feedback on the Branding Workshop and Public Awareness Event

Prior to any major development there was a requirement to consult with communities. Accordingly, a public event was planned for 26 September 2018 at the Inverness Caledonian Stadium. In addition to the statutory consultees, the event had been advertised to a wider audience through direct invitation, press and social media. Examples of the proposed display material were shown to Members.

During discussion, the following points were raised:-

- in addition to the list of invitees it was suggested that representatives from the Cromarty Firth Port Authority and the Inverness and Black Isle Community Councils be included;
- Councillors should be encouraged to keep their Community Councils informed of the proposal and developments. This could be achieved by providing Members with a summary of the key messages and a suitably adapted Fact Sheet;
- to date feedback on the short/medium proposals to address the landfill ban, due to come into force on 1 January 2021, had been positive and there had been little comment on the longer term proposal of an Energy from Waste plant;
- ideally partnership arrangements could have been explored with neighbouring local authorities i.e. Moray and Western Isles Islands Councils. However, these authorities were geographically different and had different logistical issues;
- it was hoped the current consultation on the plastic bottle deposit return scheme would reduce the use of plastic;
- photos were displayed showing the visual impact of the Materials Recycling Facility from various locations. As some of these were taken by drones, Members felt it accentuated the impact and it would be more representational if photos were taken from the level which people would see it. In addition, photographs should also be taken from other locations such as Drumossie Brae, Arturlie Point etc;
- the size of the building was similar to others in the vicinity;
- efforts should be taken to reduce light pollution emanating from the site; and
- careful attention needed to be paid to the language used, taking into account intended audiences.

The Working Group:-

- i. **NOTED** the initial feedback from the Branding Workshop and the Public Awareness Event;
- ii. **NOTED** the proposed Public Awareness material to be used;
- iii. **AGREED** that amended photographic visuals be incorporated and a review of the language used in the display material be undertaken.

6. Site Visits

Once responses had been received from Members, confirmation would be provided as to the date of the site visits to Altens Material Recovery Facility, Aberdeen and Wilton Energy from Waste Plant, Northumberland.

The Working Group **NOTED** the position.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Working Group **NOTED** that the next meeting is scheduled for 7 December 2018 at 2.00 pm.

The meeting ended at 3.20 p.m.

Highland Council

Minutes of Meeting of the **BREXIT Working Group** held in Committee Room 3, Council Headquarters, Inverness on Friday 28 September 2018 at 11.00 am.

Present

Mr J Gray
Mr A Jarvie (substitute)

Mr R MacWilliam
Mrs T Robertson

Officials in attendance

Mr A McCann, Economy & Regeneration Manager, Highland Council
Mr C Simpson, Principal Tourism & Film Officer, Development & Infrastructure, Highland Council
Mrs L Dunn, Principal Administrator, Chief Executive's Service, Highland Council

MR J GRAY IN THE CHAIR

BUSINESS

1. Appointment of Chairman

The Principal Administrator acted as Interim Chair pending the appointment of a Chairman. On seeking nominations for the post of Chairman, Mrs T Robertson, seconded by Mr R MacWilliam, nominated Mr J Gray. On there being no other nominations, Mr J Gray was duly appointed as Chairman.

At this point in the meeting, Mr J Gray assumed the position as Chair.

2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr R MacDonald and Mr S Mackie.

3. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Regional and Rural Development Policies post BREXIT

There had been circulated Report No BWG/01/18 dated 19 September 2018 by the Director of Development and Infrastructure.

During discussion, the following main points were raised:-

- Further information was sought and provided on the governance structures of regional bodies;
- In terms of the delivery body, the benefits of a regional approach were acknowledged but it was highlighted that it needed to be flexible so it could develop a programme to suit local priorities and was responsive to changing needs;

- In terms of the geography of a regional body, the public was familiar with the constituent boundaries but it was suggested that consideration should be given to extending the existing Highlands and Islands region to include areas such as Perth and Kinross and Aberdeenshire. It was explained that Highland Council was the only local authority within the Highlands and Islands region that had a city therefore the Council had more similarity with these other authority areas which could be more beneficial in terms of policy;
- Further clarity was sought and provided on the need to be nationally responsive;
- It was highlighted that the delivery of national policies locally would be more sustainable and financially beneficial for the region in the longer term;
- It was felt that there was a need for a more proactive approach to be taken, whereby seizing the opportunity to indicate what was desired and required locally; and
- With regard to funding, it was considered that the application and audit process was too onerous and there was a need for the audit process to be proportionate to the funds being received.

Thereafter, the Working Group **NOTED** the issues identified and lobbying asks of the UK and Scottish Governments as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.

5. BREXIT Summit

There had been circulated a draft BREXIT Summit proposal by the Director of Development and Infrastructure.

During discussion, the following main points were raised:-

- It was acknowledged that convening a Summit would be a good opportunity in which to identify potential issues and examine options. However, in view of the enormity of the topic and associated complexities, it was suggested that a list of specific examples, e.g. agriculture, fisheries, etc. in which to relate/consider would be helpful;
- The importance of the Fisheries sector to the region was emphasised and it was requested that consideration be given to having a dedicated item on the agenda on this matter. The Economy & Regeneration Manager explained that he was in the process of trying to secure funding to commission a detailed study on this issue as there was currently insufficient information available in order to determine the impact on this sector. Responding to this, it was suggested that it would be beneficial if the study could provide separate statistical data on fish landings and well as the fishing sector;
- In view of the wide-ranging impact of BREXIT it would be difficult to cover all topics in one Summit therefore separate specialist events might be required which would provide a platform in which to examine key sectors in more detail;
- There was a need for the risks, particularly in terms of additional costs to the Council and also third sector partner agencies, and opportunities of BREXIT to be determined;
- The impact of Europe and associated funding on the Highlands was acknowledged and it was therefore essential that the Council engaged and influenced the UK and Scottish Government in regard to future policies and funding programmes as well as lobbying for a bigger allocation of the Shared

- Prosperity Fund;
- It was highlighted that agriculture was a large financial contributor to the local economy and there was a need to consider how the future of this sector would be continued, particularly in rural areas;
 - Planning was difficult as the BREXIT negotiations were still ongoing, however it was essential that the Council did some preparation work and it was suggested that the staffing implications of EU nationals working for the Council be established. The reliance on migrant workers, both from a functional and economic perspective, was emphasised and there was a need for continued lobbying to minimise this impact. It was confirmed that the Council had been addressing this issue and an update would be circulated; and
 - It was essential that regular meetings of the Group were scheduled prior to Britain leaving the EU on 29 March 2019.

The Working Group:-

- i. **AGREED** the proposed date, agenda and speakers for the Brexit Summit as presented and that further consideration would be given to accommodating an item on the agenda regarding the Fisheries Sector;
- ii. **NOTED** that a Briefing Note would be circulated advising of the work being undertaken in preparation for BREXIT in regard to workforce planning; and
- iii. **AGREED** that regular meetings of the Group would be scheduled.

The meeting was closed at 12 noon.