

THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL
SOUTH PLANNING APPLICATIONS
COMMITTEE

8 DECEMBER 2020

MINUTES & ACTION NOTE

Listed below are the decisions taken by Committee at their virtual Microsoft Teams meeting and the actions that now require to be taken. The webcast of the meeting will be available within 48 hours of broadcast and will remain online for 12 months: <https://highland.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

A separate memorandum will be issued if detailed or further instructions are required, or where the contents of the memorandum are confidential. Please arrange to take the required action based on this action note.

Committee Members Present:

Mr R Balfour, Mr A Baxter (excluding Items 6.6 – 6.9), Mr B Boyd (excluding Items 6.12 – 7.4), Mr J Bruce, Mrs C Caddick (excluding Items 4 – 6.1), Mrs M Davidson (excluding Item 6.2), Mr L Fraser, Mr J Gray, Mr T Heggie, Mr A Jarvie (excluding Item 6.10), Mr B Lobban, Mr R MacWilliam, Mr M MacLean, Ms E Roddick (Items 6.13 and 6.15 only), Mr B Thompson (excluding Items 6.7 – 6.9)

Non-Committee Members Present:

Mr D Macpherson
Mr D Rixson

Substitutes:

None

Apologies:

None

Officers participating:

Mr D Mudie, Area Planning Manager – South (DM)
Mr S Hindson, Team Leader (SH)
Mrs S Macmillan, Team Leader (SM)
Mr Bob Robertson, Team Leader (BR)
Ms L Prins, Principal Planner (LP)
Mr John Kelly, Principal Planner (JK)
Mr K Gibson, Principal Planner (KG)
Mr R Dowell, Planner (RD)
Mr N Brockie, Planner (NB)
Mr M Clough, Senior Engineer, Transport Planning (MC)
Miss C McArthur, Principal Solicitor (CMcA)

ITEM NO	<u>DECISION</u>	<u>ACTION</u>

1	Apologies for Absence Leisgeulan	
	No apologies for absence were received.	n/a
2	Declarations of Interest Foillseachaidhean Com-pàirt	
	Mr A Jarvie declared a non-financial interest for Item 6.10.	n/a
3	Confirmation of Minutes Dearbhadh a' Gheàrr-chunntais	
	There had been submitted for confirmation as a correct record the action note and minute of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 November 2020 which was APPROVED .	n/a
4	Major Development Update Iartasan Mòra	
	There had been circulated Report No PLS/055/20 by the Area Planning Manager - providing an update on progress of all cases within the "Major" development category currently with the Infrastructure and Environment Service for determination. The Committee NOTED the current position with the applications.	SH
5	Major Developments – Pre-application consultations Leasachaidhean Mòra – Co-chomhairle Ro-iarrtais	
5.1	Applicant: Stratherrick and Foyers Community Trust (20/04309/PAN) (PLS/051/20) Location: Land 100M NW of Linden, Grays Park, Foyers Nature of Development: Community amenity masterplan comprising; Pavilion, covered pitch, trim trail/leisure walk, climbing wall, sports/leisure installations and associated access, parking and landscaping Ward: 12	
	Agreed: to note the submission and ask that the following material issues be brought to the applicant's attention in addition to the material considerations referred to in the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration to parking and access to the site • Consideration of any prevention of the site being used as an unofficial site for campervans. • Consideration of potential noise and lighting issues due to the proximity of the site to residential properties. 	EW
6	Planning Applications to be Determined	

	Iartasan Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh	
6.1	<p>Applicant: Breedon Northern Ltd (20/02154/FUL) (PLS/057/20) Location: Banavie Quarry, Banavie, Fort William. (Ward 11) Nature of Development: Lateral extension to, and further workings at existing Banavie Quarry to incorporate revised working and progressive restoration; Proposed extraction rate of up to 80,000 tonnes per annum and extension of operational lifespan to 2045. Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Members raised questions in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • past adherence to the Road Traffic Management Plan • how ongoing compliance with regulations on quarry activities are monitored • whether there was a planning role in the regulation of vehicle standards and air pollution • the visual impact of the reinstatement works • controlling access to the site <p>The case officer confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the operator had a fairly good track record • any previous breaches had been addressed by the applicant as much as possible. • 6 monthly meetings were held with the operators and local residents • the various agencies were responsible for their own area of regulation. • planning would have the opportunity to review the Environmental Management Plan every 5 years • the reinstatement involved cutting out shelves which would be profiled, planted and allowed to green up <p>During the debate, Mr B Thompson confirmed that he was content with the application, it had been long discussed and the community had been well informed.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to GRANT planning permission subject to (1) the conditions recommended in the report and (2) the prior conclusion of a modified s.75 legal agreement covering the matters set out at 8.61 of the report.</p>	SM
6.2	<p>Applicant: Mr M Romeling (20/02274/FUL) (PLS/058/20) Location: The Steading, Camas Inas, Acharacle, PH36 4JQ. (Ward 21) Nature of Development: Erection of boathouse with self-contained residential unit above. Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Mr A Baxter queried whether the application complied with paragraph 83 of Scottish Government Planning Policy and also whether proposed condition 9 prevented the property being used for holiday lets. Officers confirmed that the condition did not allow the self-contained residential unit to be used</p>	LP

	<p>for a separate permanent residential or short term holiday let. It could only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling house.</p> <p>Motion: Mr J Gray, seconded by Mrs C Caddick, to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report.</p> <p>Amendment: Mr A Baxter, seconded by Mr B Lobban, to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the development does not comply with paragraph 83 of Scottish Government Planning Policy and Guidance and is contrary to Policy 28 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan as it does not promote and enhance the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the people of Highland due to the fact it does not contribute to the economic and social development of the community.</p> <p>For the motion: Mr R Balfour, Mr J Bruce, Mrs C Caddick, Mr L Fraser, Mr J Gray, Mr T Heggie, Mr A Jarvie, Mr B Thompson</p> <p>For the amendment: Mr A Baxter, Mr B Boyd, Mr B Lobban, Mr R MacWilliam, Mr N Maclean</p> <p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report.</p>	
6.3	<p>Applicant: Mr James Macnaughton (20/01714/FUL) (PLS/059/20) Location: Glenmamie, Lochailort, PH38 4NA. (Ward 11) Nature of Development: Change of use to site 4 holiday letting pods and parking. Recommendation: Refuse.</p>	
	<p>Mr A Baxter questioned whether the informal layby opposite the junction was still able to be used. It was confirmed by the case officer that it was now blocked off and not available for parking.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about the safety of the junction.</p> <p>Mr D Rixson requested speaking rights as a local member who was not a member of the planning applications committee. He questioned the proportionality and consistency of a refusal for this development and stated that safety concerns raised regarding the speed of traffic on the road could be mitigated by the nature of the road, current signage and appropriate conditions.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11 of the planning officer's report.</p>	LP
6.4	<p>Applicant: Boleskine House Foundation SCIO (20/02471/FUL) (PLS/060/20) Location: Baile Os-Ceann, Foyers, Inverness, IV2 6XT. (Ward 12) Nature of Development: Reinstatement and alterations to fire damaged house; siting of 10No holiday twin-units, reception, store, car parking; installation of sewage treatment plant. Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	Prior to the planning officer's presentation, Miss C McArthur advised members on what constituted a material planning consideration and could	BR/EW

	<p>be taken into account and what did not constitute a material planning consideration and should be disregarded in the context of planning. She also advised Members that concerns raised within the objections submitted had been passed to the appropriate authorities to investigate.</p> <p>Mrs M Davidson raised concerns regarding the quality of the road and the access to the site and to the local cemetery.</p> <p>Mrs M Davidson also requested that the road conditions relating to safety were amended to ensure the works would be undertaken prior to construction works starting and for local member involvement in the conditions relating to planting, the replanting program and the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Mr B Thompson asked for reassurance that the footpath through the site would be able to handle increased pedestrian traffic should it form part of the South Loch Ness Trail.</p> <p>During the debate, Mrs M Davidson confirmed that the proposed restoration looked terrific, she was now assured that the building was for residential use and the chalets were sensitively sited.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions recommended in the report together with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional archaeological condition to be drafted by the case officer • Amendments to conditions 6, 12 and 14 to ensure the road safety works are undertaken prior to construction work starting • Local Members to be consulted on the conditions relating to planting and replanting plans and the traffic management plan 	
6.5	<p>Applicant: Boleskine House Foundation SCIO (20/02817/LBC) (PLS/061/20) Location: Baile Os-Ceann (Boleskine House), Foyers, Inverness IV2 6XT. (Ward 12) Nature of Development: Reinstatement of fire-damaged building, with some alterations; not including full internal fit-out. Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Mr A Jarvie queried the proposed materials to be used to finish the main building. He was advised this would be covered by condition.</p> <p>Mr R MacWilliam queried the naming conventions used by the applicant and was advised that the application was advertised by its official postal address.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions recommended in the report.</p>	NB
6.6	<p>Applicant: Springfield Properties PLC (19/05410/MSC) (PLS/062/20) Location: Land 260M SE Of Simpsons Garden Centre, Inshes, Inverness. (Ward 19) Nature of Development: Application for the approval of matters specified in Conditions 2 (Design and Layout), 4 (Surface Water Drainage Design), 5 (Access Management Plan), 6 (Noise Monitoring Scheme), 7 (Noise Barrier</p>	

	<p>and Associated Landscaping), 8 (Waste Management Strategy), 9 (Street Lighting), 10 (Active Travel Plan), 11 (Relocation of Speed Limit on Drumossie Braes), 13 (Car Parking), 15 (Archaeology), 16 (Tree Protection Fence), 17 (appointment of Aboricultural Consultant), 21 (Open Space and Landscaping), 23 (SUDs Maintenance), 25 (Above Ground Infrastructure) and 28 (Road and Active Travel Mitigation) of Planning Permission in Principle 18/05593/PIP for the Erection of 60 homes (12 flats and 48 houses) and associated infrastructure and landscaping.</p> <p>Recommendation: Approve.</p>	
	<p>Mrs C Caddick raised concerns in relation to the road layout with increased traffic and whether this would be safe. She also queried which trees were being protected by fencing and whether there are there plans to reduce speed limits in the area to 30mph. Officers confirmed tree protection fences were already in place for retained trees and that a 30mph speed limit was planned for the B9006. It was confirmed by Mr M Clough that the developer also had to submit a stage 3 road safety audit.</p> <p>Mr A Jarvie queried difference in traffic volumes between the Council and applicant and also asked that noise be assessed before the houses are built. Mr A Jarvie also queried why it was not possible to build separate turning lanes. It was confirmed that the noise would be monitored at regular intervals during construction and that the noise bund would be completed before the houses. It was also confirmed that turning lanes were not possible due to the layout of the junction and road safety concerns with the conflict of two lanes for pedestrians crossing.</p> <p>Mr D Macpherson requested to speak as a local member who is not a normal member of this planning committee and asked whether the noise bund would have an adverse effect on properties on the other side of the A9. Officers confirmed this was unlikely.</p> <p>During the debate, Mr A Jarvie stated he would like to see noise assessments undertaken before the houses are built and the acoustic barrier built before noise testing is carried out. He stated that he was not content with angle of the junction. and it should be removed and amended to create a T-junction.</p> <p>Mr B Thompson stated that the loss of trees was stark but agreed with the Transport Planning's comments in relation to the safety concerns with two lanes as he had experienced a similar issue within his own area.</p> <p>Mrs C Caddick stated that she was not happy with the safety aspects of the junction and that it hadn't been improved by the works that have been carried out to date.</p> <p>The case officer confirmed that the noise bund would be built as part of phase 1 of the development, the development will be built from the inside outwards and the noise mitigation is built into the houses and not retrofitted. The assessment will be ongoing. He confirmed that the planning authority was not in a position to change the layout of the road as it would not be consistent with the decision notice already issued for the planning permission in principle.</p> <p>Motion: Mr J Gray, seconded by Mr B Lobban to approve Matters Specified in Conditions as set out in section 11 of the report.</p>	<p>SH</p>

	<p>Amendment: Mr A Jarvie, to approve Matters Specified in Conditions with the exclusion of condition 6 on the basis that a further detailed noise impact assessment and a further scheme for noise monitoring should be submitted by the applicant. There being no seconder for the amendment, it fell.</p> <p>Agreed: to APPROVE Matters Specified in Conditions as set out in section 11 of the planning officer's report.</p> <p>Mr A Jarvie dissented the decision.</p>	
6.7	<p>Applicant: Farr Wind Farm Limited (20/03263/S36) (PLS/063/20) Location: Farr Wind Farm, Moy, Tomatin, Inverness. (Ward 19) Nature of Development: Farr Wind Farm - Variation of Section 36 Consent under the Electricity Act 1989 to extend the operational period of Farr Wind Farm from 25 years to 35 years. Recommendation: Raise no objection.</p>	
	<p>Mr A Jarvie queried mitigation in relation to any damage to the road and asked that any Construction Traffic Management Plan be sufficiently flexible in its wording to ensure that any relevant road used for maintenance operations could be captured.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to RAISE NO OBJECTION to the application to vary the section 36 consent under the Electricity Act 1989.</p>	SH
6.8	<p>Applicant: Intelligent Land Investments Group Plc (20/02589/FUL) (PLS/064/20) Location: Blackpark Farm, Nairn, IV12 5HY. (Ward 18) Nature of Development: Battery energy storage system comprising steel containers, GRP substation and fencing (output of up to 49.9MW). Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Members didn't raise any issues with the application. Mr N McLean queried whether there was any maintenance obligations for the storage units.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to GRANT planning permission subject to (1) the conditions recommended in the report and (2) an additional condition to be drafted by the case officer requiring that the development be maintained to a good standard and kept rust free.</p>	SH
6.9	<p>Applicant: Cawdor Maintenance Trust (20/00599/S42) (PLS/065/20) Location: Land to north of A96 extending from Whiteness Access Road to the Common Good land, Nairn. (Ward 18) Nature of Development: Application for Non-Compliance with Condition 33 (08/00880/OUTNA) seeking amendment of cross reference to Phasing Condition. Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Mr L Fraser confirmed he had no objection to the application. Mr T Heggie stated that it was reasonable to extend the time period in the current situation.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to GRANT planning permission subject to (1) the conditions recommended in the report and (2) the prior conclusion of a</p>	SH

	modification to the legal agreement to tie it to the modified permission.	
6.10	<p>Applicant: B & L Properties (Scotland) Ltd (20/02642/FUL) (PLS/066/20) Location: 14A Ardross Street, Inverness, IV3 5NS. (Ward 13) Nature of Development: Conversion & extension of existing former office building to provide three serviced apartments (as amended). Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Mr B Boyd raised concerns regarding the design of the property and whether it would fit into the Conservation Area. Mr B Lobban and Mrs C Caddick also raised concerns about the design of the property.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions recommended in the report together with an amendment to condition 1 to include all external building materials and not just the stone cladding.</p> <p>Members also agreed to grant delegated powers to officers to approve the external building materials in consultation with local members.</p>	BR
6.11	<p>Applicant: Gloag Investment Properties Portfolio 2 Ltd (20/01783/PIP) (PLS/067/20) Location: Land 280M SW Of Ballindoun Lodge, Beauly. (Ward 12) Nature of Development: Visitor accommodation with associated landscaping, access, footpaths, parking and associated amenity buildings. Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Agreed: to WITHDRAW the application from the agenda to allow the case officer to fully address the late representation received and to update the report accordingly before being presented at a future SPAC meeting.</p>	EW
6.12	<p>Applicant: Mr & Mrs N Wallace (20/00181/PIP (PLS/068/20) Location: Land 50m North of Fir Chlis, Daviot, Inverness. (Ward 19) Nature of Development: Erection of house. Recommendation: Refuse.</p>	
	<p>Members raised questions in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possibility of a designated passing place on the access track if granted • the relationship to the other houses • the proximity to the nearest property • what amounted to an inappropriate intrusion into previously undeveloped land <p>During the debate, Mrs C Caddick and Mr A Jarvie questioned officers on the criteria for a cohesive group. Mrs C Caddick was of the view that this is a subjective decision and the application would form part of an existing cohesive group with nearby properties, notwithstanding the creation of a new access road. Mr A Jarvie was in agreement.</p> <p>Motion: By Mr J Gray and seconded by Mr T Heggie to refuse planning permission for reasons set out at section 11 of the planning officer's report.</p>	RD

	<p>Amendment: Mrs C Caddick, seconded by Mr A Jarvie to grant planning permission on the grounds that the proposed development is in a rural setting with other residential houses close by which would meet the definition of an existing housing group. It meets the requirements of Policy 35 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan as there are three houses that are physically detached from one another, they have a perceptible relationship with one another and share a well-defined and cohesive character. The addition of a new access track to the house is not an inappropriate intrusion into previously undeveloped land as it will formalise an existing access and provide a chance to improve the hard standing for refuse and the addition of a passing place for traffic. With regard to Policies 28 and 29 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, it was not considered that the proposed development is insensitively positioned and will be compatible with the other houses close by.</p> <p>For the motion: Mr R Balfour, Mr J Gray, Mr T Heggie</p> <p>For the amendment: Mr A Baxter, Mr J Bruce, Mrs C Caddick, Mrs M Davidson, Mr A Jarvie, Mr B Lobban, Mr R MacWilliam, Mr N Maclean, Mr B Thompson</p> <p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission in principle and to grant delegated powers to the planning officer to draft appropriate planning conditions and to re-assess the level of developer contributions required in accordance with the guidance.</p>	
6.13	<p>Applicant: Bricks Capital (20/01085/FUL) (PLS/069/20) Location: 122B Academy Street, Inverness. (Ward 14) Nature of Development: Demolition of building and erection of hotel, formation of Class 11 commercial unit. Recommendation: Refuse.</p>	
	<p>Members raised concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unresolved parking issues • the height and bulk of the building • adverse effects on the neighbouring buildings in the Conservation Area • the exterior materials and colour of the building • poor design of the building • lack of inspiration taken from the City Centre <p>During the debate, Ms E Roddick stated she agreed with the descriptions of the application as “monolithic” and “three concrete blocks” and also with Historic Environment Scotland’s comments regarding the impact the development would have on the local area, particularly the Old High Kirk. Mr R MacWilliam, Mr A Jarvie, Mr A Baxter and Mr B Lobban all agreed with this assessment.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11 of the planning officer’s report.</p>	JK
6.14	<p>Applicant: Inverness Paving Ltd (20/01728/FUL) (PLS/070/20) Location: Land at Treetop Stables, Faebuie, Culloden Moor, Inverness. (Ward19)</p>	

	<p>Nature of Development: Change of use from equestrian centre to holiday, leisure and hospitality facilities including 13 lodges, cafe/shop, reception, laundry and restaurant</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Mrs C Caddick asked if many changes had been made since the previous application for this site and whether the felling of commercial trees nearby would make the site visible from Culloden Battlefield. The case officer confirmed the changes made were minimal and based on the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment provided by the agent, the development would only be partially visible from the north and would not be visible from the southern area of the Battlefield site if the trees were felled.</p> <p>Mr R MacWilliam questioned use of the term “core battlefield area”. Mr R MacWilliam also stated that he did not agree that the application complied with planning policy.</p> <p>Mr A Jarvie queried whether acceptable visibility could be achieved from the entrance to the site, the number of traffic movements from the site and the responses from Historic Environment Scotland and the Council’s own Historic Environment Team.</p> <p>Agreed: unanimously to REFUSE planning permission on the grounds that the proposed development would promote unnecessary and unacceptable commercial activity within the boundary of Culloden Battlefield and is contrary to the following:</p> <p>Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 in that the application does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area as it relates to the battlefield.</p> <p>Policy 57 of the Highland wide Local Development Plan as the development has not adequately demonstrated that it would not compromise the natural environment, amenity and heritage resource of the Culloden Muir Conservation Area. It will have a have a significant detrimental effect on the Culloden Battlefield, which is a heritage site of national importance. It will be partially visible in between the development site and the Battlefield once the commercial woodland has been felled. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the significant adverse effects of this development have been clearly outweighed by any social or economic benefits of national importance.</p> <p>Policy 28 of the Highland-wide development plan (Sustainable Design) as the development does not demonstrate sensitive siting.</p> <p>Policy 29 of the Highland-wide development plan (Design Quality and Place-making) as the proposed development is inappropriately sited in the Battlefield and does not make a positive contribution to the architectural and visual quality of the place.</p> <p>Policy 52 of the Highland wide Local Development Plan as it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that there is a need to develop the wooded site and does not offer a clear and significant public benefit.</p>	<p>JK</p>

	<p>Paragraph 149 of Scottish Government Planning Policy as the application fails to protect, conserve or enhance the key landscape characteristics and special qualities of a site in the Inventory of Historic Battlefields.</p> <p>Policy 1 of the planning policies of the Culloden Muir Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan as the application does not overcome the presumption against all development within the designated battlefield as it is not convincingly supported by the local development plan or other planning policy and would not result in a development commensurate with the principal designation of the site as a Battlefield.</p> <p>Policy 2 of the planning policies of the Culloden Muir Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan as the application has not demonstrated that the development will either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the planning policies of the Culloden Muir Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan as the application has failed to produce a design statement which demonstrates how the development proposals will either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Culloden Muir Conservation Area.</p> <p>Policy 8 of the Culloden Muir Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan as it fails to overcome the presumption against any development which is likely to have adverse impact on the setting of important historic environment assets.</p>	
6.15	<p>Applicant: Mr T Manda; Fairfield Care Home (Inverness) Ltd (20/02575/FUL) (PLS/071/20)</p> <p>Location: 68-70 Fairfield Road, Inverness. (Ward 14)</p> <p>Nature of Development: Change of use of vacant care home to a house.</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant.</p>	
	<p>Ms E Roddick moved to defer consideration of the application to the next meeting of South Planning Application Committee on the basis that changes had been made to the application recently and local residents had not been properly consulted on these or had the opportunity to comment. Deferral would allow consultation with local residents and an updated report to be produced.</p>	
	<p>Agreed: to DEFER consideration of the application to the meeting of SPAC on 3 February 2021 to allow local residents to be re-consulted on the changes made by the applicant during the planning application process and for the report to be updated to reflect these changes.</p>	KG
7	<p>Decision of Appeals to the Scottish Government Planning and Environmental Appeals Division Co-dhùnadh mu Iarrtas do Bhuidheann-stiùiridh Riaghaltas na h-Alba airson Lùth agus Atharrachadh Aimsir</p>	
7.1	<p>Applicant: Mr Mathieson (PPA-270-2227) (19/00982/FUL)</p> <p>Location: Land 35 Metres East Of 38 Old Perth Road, Inverness IV2 3RQ (Ward 16)</p> <p>Nature of Development: Formation of access road to serve residential development comprising 24 dwellings.</p>	

	Agreed: to NOTE the decision of the Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers to allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed at the end of the notice.	SH
7.2	Applicant: Mr R Mathieson (PPA-270-2226) (19/00990/PIP) Location: Drakies House, Culcabock Avenue, Inverness, IV2 3RQ (Ward 16) Nature of Development: Development of 24 residential units comprising 6 detached villas, 4 town houses, 6 semi-detached houses and 8 flats.	
	Agreed: to NOTE the decision of the Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers to allow the appeal and grant planning permission in principle subject to the conditions listed in the schedule at the end of the notice, following the signing and registering or recording of a planning obligation under section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 or some suitable alternative arrangement covering the matters listed in paragraph 37.	SH
7.3	Applicant: Wren Kitchens Ltd (ADA-270-2000) (20/00880/ADV) Location: I 7 Eastfield Way, Inverness, IV2 7GD (Ward) Nature of Development: Erection of a sign.	
	Agreed: to NOTE the decision of the Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers allow the appeal and grant advertisement consent, subject to the standard conditions for the display of advertisements that are specified in Part 1 of Schedule 1 to The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984 and to the additional conditions set out at the end of the notice.	JB
8	Decisions of Scottish Ministers	
8.1	Application: MRH Design on behalf of Mr Mark and Mrs Gillian Hornby (NOD-HLD-006) (18/04194/FUL) Location: Land south west of Culchunaig Farmhouse, Westhill, Inverness, IV2 5BS (Ward 19) Nature of Development: Conversion of steading to form house and erection of outbuildings (amended design to planning permission 15/02941/FUL)	
	Agreed: to NOTE the decision of Scottish Ministers to disagree with the Reporter and refuse planning permission for the proposed development.	CMac
	Meeting concluded at 6:40PM	