

## The Highland Council

Minutes of Meeting of the **City of Inverness Area Committee** held REMOTELY on **Thursday, 26 August 2021** at 10.00 am.

### **Present:**

Mr C Aitken	Mr A Graham
Mr R Balfour	Mr J Gray
Mr B Boyd	Mr A Jarvie
Mrs C Caddick	Ms E Knox
Miss J Campbell	Mrs I MacKenzie
Mrs G Campbell-Sinclair	Mr D Macpherson
Mrs H Carmichael	Mr R MacWilliam
Mr A Christie	Mrs B McAllister
Mrs M Davidson	Ms E Roddick
Mr D Fraser	Mr C Smith
Mr K Gowans	

### **Officials in Attendance:**

Mr A Gunn, Executive Chief Officer - Transformation  
Mr M MacLeod, Executive Chief Officer – Infrastructure, Economy & Environment  
Mr C Howell, Head of Infrastructure  
Mr C Baxter, Planner, Planning & Environment  
Mr S Manning, Principal Traffic Officer, Roads & Transport  
Mr J Taylor, Roads Operation Manager, Roads & Transport  
Ms A Clark, Head of Policy & Reform  
Mr D Haas, Inverness City Area Manager  
Miss J MacLennan, Democratic Services Manager  
Miss M Murray, Committee Administrator  
Ms F MacBain, Committee Administrator

### **Also in attendance:**

Mr P Strachan, Chair, Inverness Business Improvement District  
Mr M Smith, Manager, Inverness Business Improvement District  
Mr M Goulding, Chief Executive Officer, Visit Inverness Loch Ness

**An asterisk in the margin denotes a recommendation to the Council. All decisions with no marking in the margin are delegated to Committee.**

### **Mrs H Carmichael in the Chair**

Prior to the commencement of the formal business, the Provost & Leader of Inverness and Area congratulated Mr Colin Aitken on his election as a Councillor for Ward 13 (Inverness West) and welcomed him to the meeting.

Thereafter, both the Provost and the Leader of the Council paid tribute to former Councillor Jack Shiels who had recently passed away and conveyed their condolences to his family.

## Business

### 1. Apologies for Absence Leisgeulan

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr I Brown and Mrs T Robertson.

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

The Committee **NOTED** the following declarations of interest:-

Item 4: Mr A Christie (financial and non-financial) and Mrs H Carmichael (non-financial)

Item 5: Mrs H Carmichael (non-financial)

Item 6: Mrs I Mackenzie (non-financial)

Item 8: Mr A Jarvie (non-financial)

Item 8.4: Mr K Gowans (financial)

Item 10: Mr A Jarvie (non-financial)

Item10e: Miss J Campbell (non-financial)

In terms of Standing Order 9, the Committee **AGREED** to consider Item 13v at this point in the meeting.

### 13v. Minutes of City and Area Recovery Group held on 17 May and 1 July 2021

The Executive Chief Officer Infrastructure, Environment and Economy provided an update on the work of the City Area Recovery Group and the plan to bring together workstreams. In this regard, it was noted that a Member Workshop was being arranged and would be held in September.

The Committee **NOTED** the position and **APPROVED** the Minutes of the City and Area Recovery Group held on 17 May and 1 July 2021 as circulated.

### 3. Appointment of the Depute Provost and Depute Leader of Inverness and Area

Mrs M Davidson, seconded by Mr A Christie, moved the appointment of Mrs C Caddick as Depute Provost and Depute Leader of Inverness and Area.

There being no other nominations, it was **AGREED** to appoint Mrs C Caddick to the position which she accepted.

### 4. Annual Report on Inverness Business Improvement District

#### Declarations of Interest –

**Mr A Christie declared a financial interest in this item as a Non-Executive Director of NHS Highland and a non-financial interest as General Manager of Inverness, Badenoch and Strathspey Citizens Advice Bureau but, having applied the test outlined in Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of the**

**Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that his interests did not preclude his involvement in the discussion.**

**Mrs H Carmichael declared a non-financial Interest as a Board Member of Inverness Business Improvement District but, having applied the test outlined in Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that her interest did not preclude her involvement in the discussion.**

There had been circulated Joint Report No. CIA/22/21 dated 12 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer (Communities and Place) and the Inverness City Area Manager.

In that regard, Mr P Strachan, Chair of Inverness Business Improvement District (BID), undertook a presentation on the current work being undertaken by BID, including proposals for future projects.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

- the Inverness BID Manager and Team should be commended on the support they had provided to businesses over what had been a very difficult period, including their work in profiling businesses online;
- the potential to expand the boundaries of the Inverness BID to involve and support more businesses was highlighted;
- opportunities to work closely with High Life Highland and other partners on events and festivals over the Autumn/Winter period in order to attract more visitors to the City Centre should be pursued;
- the current challenges with the food supply chain and the potential shortage of some goods had to be acknowledged and it would be important for the Council to be ready to help to mitigate any issues if/when they arose; and
- the proposals for Inverness Bid, Eastgate Centre and the Council to work in partnership on a range of potential projects to promote the City Centre, including over the festive period, were welcomed.

Thereafter, and having thanked Mr Strachan for his presentation, the Committee otherwise **NOTED**:-

- i. the work detailed in the report; and
- ii. the ongoing development of partnership working.

## **5. Visit Inverness Loch Ness Annual Report Roinn Leasachadh Gnothachais Turasachd Inbhir Nis Loch Nis**

**Declaration of Interest – Mrs H Carmichael declared a non-financial Interest in this item as a Board member of Inverness Business Improvement District but, having applied the test outlined in Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that her interest did not preclude her involvement in the discussion.**

There had been circulated Joint Report No CIA/23/21 dated 12 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer Communities and Place and the Inverness City Area Manager.

In that regard, Mr M Goulding, Chief Executive Officer, Visit Inverness Loch Ness, undertook a presentation in respect of the Visit Inverness Loch Ness Annual Report.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

- the Annual Report and update which had been provided for the Committee was encouraging and there was cause for optimism going forward;
- there was a need for more information on where the new Highland Tourism Group would be placed in relation to Visit Inverness Loch Ness. As such, there was a need to explore all opportunities to work collaboratively with other partners and high profile figures from the area to promote the Highlands to the widest possible audience;
- the level of funding which had been secured from VisitScotland's Sector and Destination Organisation Marketing Fund was welcomed in view of the range of activity this could deliver; and
- there was a need to acknowledge the additional support which would be required for businesses who had experienced loss of income due to the pandemic in order to ensure that they were sustainable going forward over the short and medium term.

Thereafter, and having thanked Mr Goulding for his presentation, the Committee otherwise **NOTED** the Annual Report of Visit Inverness Loch Ness as circulated.

**6. Spaces for People – Update and Next Steps**  
**Àiteachan do Dhaoine – Roghainnean airson Atharrachaidhean Maireannach**

**Declaration of Interest - Mrs I Mackenzie declared a non-financial interest in this item on the grounds that a family member had organised a petition but, having applied the test outlined in Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that her interest did not preclude her involvement in the discussion.**

There had been circulated Report No. CIA/24/21 dated 9 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer (Infrastructure, Environment and Economy).

There had also been circulated Additional Spaces for People Data Sheets.

Following detailed presentations in relation to all 4 of the undernoted interventions, and during discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

**Academy Street**

- there had been considerable public interest in this issue, with mixed views having been put forward, but this was an opportunity to now improve for the future and as such there was a need to highlight the long term issues and in particular the significant advantages which could be gained;

- it would be a concern if funding was lost through not agreeing the recommendation to retain a Spaces for People intervention;
- it was imperative that the needs of people with disabilities (who often struggled to use Academy Street safely) were taken into account in making this decision and it was therefore suggested that the temporary measures currently in place should be replaced with more accessible and safer measures, It was also proposed that, before installing permanent measures, a full accessibility assessment should be undertaken;
- it was felt by some that the current intervention was not effective as it was not being used by members of the public and that it should now be removed and Academy Street returned to the pre-existing road layout;
- it was important to ensure that funding from the Scottish Government was spent wisely and whilst many people supported the principle of what had been undertaken, it had also been suggested that it could be done differently;
- it was imperative that a strategic approach, with 'joined up thinking', was adopted during debate and in taking account of the views of the general public;
- whilst the temporary measures were not perfect, it had to be acknowledged that returning to the 'status quo' would be extremely difficult for many and as such it was vital to identify and implement improvements, not least in order to address climate change issues for the future;
- the measures currently in place had been necessary in order to deal with issues in relation to Covid-19 and it had to be highlighted that this pandemic was most definitely not over and that cases were currently rising sharply in the Highland area;
- Academy Street had previously been identified as being one of the most polluted streets in Scotland and this was now an opportunity to take a holistic approach in working with partners whilst listening to the needs and concerns of local businesses and residents;
- there was concern about the current width of the road whilst the current measures were in place, not least in terms of access for emergency services and larger/wider vehicles;
- there had been a number of complaints that the current bollards were in fact dangerous for motorists, cyclist and pedestrians;
- it was also the case that in terms of considering options for the future, account should be taken of the fact that not everyone was able to cycle or walk;
- a full impact assessment across all sectors of society to seek views, perhaps led by a Stakeholder Group, would be welcomed;
- from research which had been undertaken, it appeared that many other Councils were currently dismantling their Spaces for People interventions, particularly around shopping areas;
- it had to be highlighted that public transport had to be of a sufficient standard if people were to be encouraged not to use cars and this was currently not the case in Inverness;
- a full public consultation on this issue was needed and should be progressed by the Council, with a further report to the City Committee thereafter; and

- discussion had been undertaken around various issues pertaining to Academy Street for over thirty years but the current situation now necessitated the need to show leadership and take a firm decision on how to proceed for the future.

Thereafter, Ms E Knox, seconded by Ms E Roddick, **MOVED** that recommendation 2(ii) within the report should be amended to read as follows – ‘Agree to retain a Spaces for People intervention in Academy Street’. Also, that the following sub paragraph should be added – ‘Replace the temporary Spaces for People measures currently in place with more accessible and safer measures, Before installing permanent measures, agree to undertake a full accessibility assessment’.

As an **AMENDMENT**, Mr A Jarvie, seconded by Mr C Smith, moved the removal of the measures and to revert to road.

On a vote being taken, the **MOTION** received 14 votes and the **AMENDMENT** received 6 votes and the **MOTION** was therefore **CARRIED**, the votes having been cast as follows:-

**For the Motion:**

E Knox, E Roddick, C Aitken, R Balfour, B Boyd, C Caddick, J Campbell, H Carmichael, M Davidson, D Fraser, K Gowans, J Gray, R MacWilliam and B McAllister.

**For the Amendment:**

A Jarvie, C Smith, A Christie, A Graham, I MacKenzie and D Macpherson.

**Riverside Way**

- it was suggested that, in addition to the recommendation within the report to retain the Spaces for People intervention and promote a permanent Traffic Regulation Order, there should be a report submitted to the next meeting of the Committee to provide more detail on the specifics of the proposals;
- whilst recognising the good intentions behind the proposals which dealt with a complex set of issues in this area, it was felt that the proposed scheme would cause too much detriment to existing users and a significant level of disruption to very busy part of Inverness. As such, it was a feeling amongst many local residents that the current measures should be removed and revert to a 2-way road;
- only about one third of the traffic on Riverside Way was motorised so on that basis it was not considered appropriate to remove the Active Travel infrastructure;
- this was one of the most attractive walkways in the City and there should therefore be a focus on all alternatives to the current proposals. In this regard, there was anecdotal evidence that changing from 2-way traffic to 1-way traffic often led to an increase in the speed of vehicles and for that reason the former would be the preferred option in this instance;
- any agreed proposal should take account of previous problems with traffic in this area and lead to future improvements;

- it was imperative that account was taken of public opinion and particularly local residents who lived and worked in the area as they would have to deal with any changes on a daily basis;
- this was a real opportunity to work in partnership with the local community and as such improved community consultation was the correct way to now proceed;
- it was especially important to find a solution for the specific area outside the Cathedral which then led along to the Bridge;
- it had to be acknowledged that making changes to the traffic flow on any of the sections within this proposal could have an impact on the whole of the area and also have unintended consequences through the diversion of traffic to other roads/streets in the vicinity.

Thereafter, the Provost, seconded by Mr J Gray, **MOVED** to retain the Spaces for People intervention and promote a permanent Traffic Regulation Order and to bring a report to the next meeting with more detail on the proposals.

As an **AMENDMENT**, Mr A Graham, seconded by Mr B Boyd, moved the removal of the measures and to revert to a 2-way road.

On a vote being taken, the **MOTION** received 10 votes and the **AMENDMENT** received 9 votes, with 1 abstention, and the **MOTION** was therefore **CARRIED**, the votes having been cast as follows:-

**For the Motion:**

H Carmichael, J Gray, C Aitken, C Caddick, M Davidson, D Fraser, K Gowans, D Macpherson, B McAllister and E Roddick.

**For the Amendment:**

A Graham, B Boyd, R Balfour, J Campbell, A Christie, A Jarvie, I MacKenzie, R MacWilliam and C Smith.

**Abstention:** E Knox

**Castle 1-way system**

- it was felt that removing the current measures and reverting to a 2-way road would address the current level of complaints from members of the public and the dangerous traffic issues currently being experienced;
- the current arrangements had proved to be very controversial with the public and their retention appeared to offer the least benefit in terms of the options which had been presented within the report;
- it had been pointed out that the pollution from idling vehicles in the area outweighed the modest decline in the level of traffic;
- there had been many complaints received and it had been suggested that this scheme had been fundamentally flawed from the outset;
- whilst acknowledging the level of complaints, it was also important to recognise that the situation with traffic in Castle Street had not been perfect previously and there was now an opportunity to make improvements. As such, it was suggested that the current measure should be retained until a consultation led scheme had been delivered;

- it was imperative that discussion was undertaken with local businesses and residents on the way forward for this particular location;
- it had to be accepted that the current arrangements were confusing and therefore not safe;
- a very high level of representations on the current situation in Castle Street had now been received and it was therefore clear that this was causing considerable chaos and stress for many which was not of any benefit;
- it should be highlighted that the diversion of traffic was having a detrimental effect on the surrounding streets and causing serious problems in that regard;
- the development of alternatives to the current measures, in consultation with users and the local community, should be pursued;
- the severe effect on local businesses in Castle Street and the surrounding areas had to be recognised;
- a further report on the City Vision should be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee and in this regard it was noted that there were plans for a Members Workshop in this respect in the following month;
- there were serious concerns about the delays which had been witnessed for emergency vehicles on Castle Street;
- whilst accepting the concerns which had been raised, it had to be acknowledged that removing the present scheme would not solve all of the historic and current issues pertaining to Castle Street. As such, it was the responsibility of all Elected Members to review what was happening and put forward proposals for redesign/improvements for the future;
- it was suggested that Officers should be asked to review the current traffic management arrangements which circumvented the Castle and bring a report back to the Committee at a later date whilst taking account of the potential impact of the Castle becoming a major visitor attraction; and
- there was serious concern amongst Members in relation to late information from Officers at the meeting in terms of the potential timescale for the removal of the current measures/restoration of 2-way road (if that was the Committee decision after a vote) and also in regard to new information being provided on the need for replacement of traffic signals/reconstruction of the View Place junction and associated timescales for this work.

Thereafter, Mr A Jarvie, seconded by Mrs I MacKenzie, **MOVED** removal of the measures and restore to 2-way road.

As an **AMENDMENT**, Ms E Knox, seconded by the Provost, moved removal of the measures and restore to 2-way road whilst alternatives were developed in pursuance of the Spaces for People project in consultation with users and the local community. Also, to ask Officers to review the traffic management arrangements that circumvented the Castle with a report back to the City Committee at a later date, taking account of the potential impact of the Castle becoming a major visitor attraction.



On a vote being taken, the **MOTION** received 12 votes and the **AMENDMENT** received 8 votes and the **MOTION** was therefore **CARRIED**, the votes having been cast as follows:-

**For the Motion:**

A Jarvie, I MacKenzie, R Balfour, J Campbell, G Campbell-Sinclair, A Christie, K Gowans, A Graham, D Macpherson, R MacWilliam, B McAllister and C Smith.

**For the Amendment:**

E Knox, H Carmichael, C Aitken, B Boyd, C Caddick, D Fraser, J Gray and E Roddick.

**Millburn Road**

- it was suggested that there was a need for removal of the current interventions and also, in recognising the need to shift the balance of travel, the establishment of a balanced stakeholder group of business representatives and owners, walking, cycling, disabled and motorist groups, local residents, Community Councillors and Elected Members. This would help in the production of an active travel masterplan with route specifics which would enable future measures to be rolled out in an informed manner, taking into account the needs of all;
- there was a need for the installation of a pedestrian crossing, not least to protect the numbers of school pupils attempting to cross a very busy road and to slow down the traffic. In this regard, it was acknowledged that the provision of such crossings could be very expensive but it was suggested that this was outweighed by the fact that this was a serious health & safety issue and that it could perhaps be provided through Safer Routes to Schools work;
- it would be helpful if Sustrans could provide an update for the Committee on proposals previously considered for this location;
- it was felt that the cycle lanes were very wide and it was queried as to whether the proportions were able to be amended in any way;
- in view of its status as a gateway to the City, there was a need to improve the surface of Millburn Road; and
- it would be important for all opportunities to be taken to improve/redesign/develop Millburn Road for current and future users.

Thereafter, Mr A Jarvie, seconded by Mrs I MacKenzie, **MOVED** the removal of all Millburn interventions and a return to the previous state. Also, to bring forward proposals to a future meeting to show the potential of developing an active travel route, without removing carriageway lanes, and the options for a crossing at the eastern end of Millburn Road.

As an **AMENDMENT**, Mr K Gowans, seconded by Ms E Knox, moved to alter the Spaces for People intervention to retain the lane from the Morrison's junction to the Eastgate underpass and revert the rest to road – with a pedestrian crossing north of Millburn Academy on Millburn Road to connect the bus stops on either side of the road to be factored in.

On a vote being taken, the **MOTION** received 8 votes and the **AMENDMENT** received 11 votes and the **AMENDMENT** was therefore **CARRIED**, the votes having been cast as follows:-

**For the Motion:**

A Jarvie, I MacKenzie, C Caddick, J Campbell, A Christie, A Graham, D Macpherson and C Smith.

**For the Amendment:**

K Gowans, E Knox, C Aitken, B Boyd, G Campbell-Sinclair, H Carmichael, M Davidson, D Fraser, J Gray, R MacWilliam and B McAllister.

The Committee:-

- i. **NOTED** the progress in implementing the project and the legacy the interventions had provided for transforming the City Centre;
- ii. **AGREED** to retain a Spaces for People intervention in Academy Street and replace the temporary Spaces for People measures currently in place with more accessible and safer measures. Before installing permanent measures, it was also agreed to undertake a full accessibility assessment;
- iii. **AGREED** to retain the Spaces for People intervention for Riverside Way and promote a permanent Traffic Regulation Order and to bring a report to the next meeting with more detail on the proposals;
- iv. **AGREED** to remove all measures in relation to the Castle 1-way system and restore to 2--way road; and
- v. **AGREED** to alter the Spaces for People intervention for Millburn Road to retain the lane from the Morrison's junction to the Eastgate underpass and revert the rest to road. It was also agreed that a pedestrian crossing north of Millburn Academy on Millburn Road to connect the bus stops on either side of the road should be factored in.

## **7. Winter Maintenance Plan 2021/22 Prògram Obair-glèidhidh Geamhraidh airson 2021/22**

There had been circulated Report No. CIA/25/21 dated 16 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Office Infrastructure, Environment and Economy.

The Committee **AGREED** the Winter Maintenance Plan for the Inverness Area in reference to the Briefing Note at Appendix A of the report.

## 8. Inverness Wards Place Based Investment Funds – Proposed Funding Allocations

### Declarations of Interest –

**Mr K Gowans** declared a financial interest in this item as an employee of Inverness College, UHI and, despite having no direct financial benefit, did not participate in the item.

**Mr A Jarvie** declared a non-financial interest in this item as a Director of High Life Highland but, as a Council appointee and in terms of the specific exclusion in Section 5.18 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that his interest did not preclude his involvement in the discussion.

There had been circulated Report No CIA/26/21 dated 26 July 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer, Communities and Place.

The Committee **AGREED** the proposed allocations of Place Based Investment Funds as follows:

- i. Ward 12
  - a. Investment in Play Parks - £20,000
  - b. Investment in paths/trails - £30,000
  - c. Investment in cycle networks - £15,000
  - d. Community led proposals - £35,000
  - e. Total = £100,000
- ii. Ward 13
  - a. Investment in Play Parks - £50,000
  - b. Investment in residential path improvement - £20,000
  - c. Investment in secondary school growing projects - £20,000
  - d. Investment in primary school well-being projects - £10,000
  - e. Total = £100,000
- iii. Ward 15
  - a. Investment in Befriending Scheme (jointly with Ward 16) - £30,000
  - b. Castle Heather Park improvements - £22,000
  - c. MacDonald Park improvements - £20,000
  - d. Culduthel Woods improvements - £5,000
  - e. Promotion of environmental awareness in 4 Primary Schools - £8,000
  - f. Holm Path improvements - £10,000
  - g. Holm Grown grant support - £5,000
  - h. Total = £100,000
- iv. Ward 16
  - a. Investment in Play Parks - £55,000
  - b. Investment in Befriending Scheme (jointly with Ward 15) - £15,000
  - c. Fitness & Well-being initiative - £30,000
  - d. Total = £100,000
- v. Ward 17
  - a. Housing Need Assessment – Amount to be confirmed
  - b. Community Growing projects – Amount to be confirmed

- c. Reports will be brought back to future CIAC
  
- vi. Ward 19
  - a. Inshes Community Park - £50,000
  - b. Inverness College UHI ABC Garden Project - £50,000
  - c. Total = £100,000

and **NOTED** the identified priority areas for the following two Wards and that reports detailing funding allocation proposals would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee:

- vii. Ward 14
  - a. Mental health and wellbeing of communities with a specific focus on developing community spaces including play areas.
  
- viii. Ward 17
  - a. Housing needs assessment
  - b. Community growing projects

#### **9. Inverness Common Good Fund: Discretionary Scheme for Winter Payments 2021/22**

There had been circulated Joint Report No. CIA/27/21 dated 1 July 2021 by the Interim Head of Revenues & Business Support and the Inverness City Area Manager.

During discussion, several Members commended the scheme and praised the work of the welfare team.

Thereafter, the Committee **AGREED** the following recommendations for the 2021/22 Inverness Winter Payments Discretionary Scheme:-

- i. to accept applications from 1 December 2021 to 28 February 2022 inclusive;
- ii. to increase the single tier payment for those applicants that satisfied the eligibility criteria for the Scheme for 2021/22 by 12-month (May 2021) Consumer Price Index (2.1%) to £88;
- iii. to provide a budget of £200,000 as agreed by Members at the August 2020 Committee meeting to accommodate the continuing demand arising from Covid-19, ongoing welfare reforms and fluctuations in energy costs;
- iv. that the criteria utilised for the 2020/21 scheme as set out in paragraphs 8.2 to 8.6 of the report should be used as the basis for the 2021/22 scheme;
- v. that the discretionary scheme be made available to residents in the City of Inverness and the landward areas of the seven City Wards; and
- vi. promoted payment by BACS for this discretionary scheme as this was the most secure method of payment for recipients of the payment and the Council alike.

**10. Inverness Common Good Fund  
Maoin Math Coitcheann Inbhir Nis**

**Declaration of Interest - Mr A Jarvie declared a non-financial interest in this item as a Director of High Life Highland but, as a Council appointee and in terms of the specific exclusion in Section 5.18 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that his interest did not preclude his involvement in the discussion.**

**a) Victorian Market, Inverness – Action Plan – Update  
Cunntas Bliadhnaidh na Margaidh Bhictòrianaich**

There had been circulated Joint Report No. CIA/28/21 dated 28 July 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer (Infrastructure, Environment and Economy) and the Executive Chief Officer (Communities and Place).

The Committee **NOTED**:-

- i. the progress in respect of the work agreed through the Action Plan since the reports presented to Committee on 29 August and 21 November 2019 and 27 August 2020.
- ii. the progress of the works for the transformation of the Market Hall and Fish Hall of the Victorian Market.
- iii. that all practicable steps continued to be taken to maximise third party funding opportunities;
- iv. that further reports would be made to the City of Inverness Area Committee on progress; and
- v. that the Victorian Market Stakeholder Group had delivered on the key aims of establishing an Action Plan for the Victorian Market and developing a significant infrastructure project.

**b) Inverness Common Good Fund Sub-Committee Annual Report 2019/20  
Aithisg Bhliadhnaidh Fo-Chomataidh Maoin Math Coitcheann Inbhir Nis**

There had been circulated Report No. CIA/29/21 dated 9 July 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer Communities and Place.

The Committee **NOTED** the work of the Inverness Common Good Fund Sub-Committee as described within the report.

**c) Financial Monitoring  
Sgrùdadh Ionmhasail**

There had been circulated Joint Report No. CIA/30/21 dated 6 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer Resources and Finance and the Inverness City Area Manager.

The Committee **NOTED** the financial monitoring report to 30 June 2021 and that overall expenditure was within agreed budgets.

**d) Capital Projects**  
**Pròiseactan Calpa**

There had been circulated Joint Report No. CIA/31/21 dated 6 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer Infrastructure, Economy & Environment and the Executive Chief Officer Communities and Place.

The Committee **NOTED** the current status of capital projects.

**e) Grants Applications over £10,000**  
**Iarrtasan Tabhartais thar £10,000**

**Declaration of Interest - Miss J Campbell declared a non-financial interest in this item as a Board Member of Eden Court Highlands but, having applied the test outlined in Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct, concluded that her interest did not preclude her involvement in the discussion**

There had been circulated Report No. CIA/32/21 dated 10 August 2021 by the Executive Chief Officer Resources and Finance. A copy of supporting documentation had also been circulated as Booklet A.

The Committee determined the current grant applications as follows:-

- 1) Visit Inverness Loch Ness Ltd (VILN) – **APPROVED** a grant of £20,000;
- 2) Change Your World Events Ltd – **APPROVED** a grant of £3,000; and
- 3) Fraser Park Bowling Club – **APPROVED** a grant of £12,799.

**11. Recess Powers**  
**Cumhachdan Fosaidh**

It was **NOTED** that the Recess Powers granted by the Council at its meeting on 24 June 2021 had not been exercised in relation to the business of this Committee.

**12. Membership of Committees, etc**  
**Ballarachd Chomataidhean, msaa**

The Committee **AGREED** to appoint:-

- i. Mrs G Campbell-Sinclair and Mr D Macpherson to the Inverness Common Good Fund Sub-Committee;
- ii. Mrs C Caddick to the Events and Festivals Working Group;
- iii. Mr A Jarvie to the Inverness City Arts Working Group;
- iv. Mr C Aitken to the City and Area Recovery Group; and
- v. Mr C Aitken to Inverness Area Sports Council.

### 13. Minutes Geàrr-chunntas

The Committee:-

- i. **NOTED** the Minutes of the City of Inverness Area Committee held on 27 May 2021;
- ii. **APPROVED** the Minutes of the Inverness Common Good Fund Sub-Committee held on 9 August 2021;
- iii. **NOTED** the Minutes of the Victorian Market Stakeholder Management Group held on 29 June 2021; and
- iv. **APPROVED** the Minutes of the Inverness Events and Festivals Working Group held on 28 June 2021.

### 14. Exclusion of the Public Às-dùnadh a' Phobail

The Committee **RESOLVED** that, under Section 50A(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 6 and 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 7A of the Act.

### 15. Inverness Common Good Fund - Sites and Premises Transaction Report Aithisg Gnothachais Làraich agus Togalaichean Chunntasan Maoin Math Choitcheann Inbhir Nis

There had been circulated to Members only Joint Report No CIA/33/21 dated 30 July 2021 by the Head of Development and Regeneration and the Property Manager (Estates).

The Committee **NOTED** the recommendations as detailed in the report.

The meeting ended at 4.30pm.