

**The Highland Council
South Planning Applications
Committee**

**Council Chamber, HQ, Wednesday 18 June 2025, 9.30am
Minute / Action Note**

Listed below are the decisions taken by Committee at their recent 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.

Meeting on 18 June 2025

Committee Members Present:

Mr C Ballance	Mrs I MacKenzie (Remote)
Mr D Fraser	Mr T MacLennan (Remote)
Mr L Fraser	Mr D Macpherson (Remote)
Mr A Graham	Mr P Oldham
Mr M Gregson	Ms M Reid
Mr R Jones	Ms L Saggars
Mr B Lobban	Ms K Willis

Officers participating:

Mr B Robertson, Acting Area Planning Manager – South (BR)
Mr P Wheelan, Strategic Projects Team Leader (PW)
Ms L Prins, Principal Planner (LP)
Mr K Gibson, Principal Planner (KG)
Mr J Kelly, Planner (JK)
Mr M Fitzpatrick, Planner (MF)
Ms E Watt, Planner (EW)
Ms JA Bain (JAB)
Mr M Clough, Senior Engineer, Transport Planning (MC)
Ms A Gibbs, Principal Solicitor
Ms K Arnott, Committee Officer

In attendance:

Lauren Riach – Consents & Environment Strategy Manager, SSEN
Callum Petrie – Senior Consents & Environment Manager, SSEN
Patrick McGarrigle – Senior Project Manager (Delivery), SSEN
Adam Porter – Lead Engineer, SSEN

Meeting on 19 June 2025

Committee Members Present:

Mr C Ballance	Mr B Lobban
Mr D Fraser	Mr T MacLennan (Remote)
Mr L Fraser (left during item 6.10)	Mr P Oldham
Mr A Graham	Ms M Reid (left during item 6.10)
Mr M Gregson	Ms L Saggars (Remote)
Mr R Jones	Ms K Willis (Remote)

Officers participating:

Mr B Robertson, Acting Area Planning Manager – South (BR)

Mr R Dowell, Planner (RD)

Mr M Clough, Senior Engineer, Transport Planning (MC)

Ms A Gibbs, Principal Solicitor

Ms K Arnott, Committee Officer

ITEM NO	DECISION	ACTION
	In terms of Standing Order 9 the Committee agreed to consider Item 7.1 after Item 4, and that Item 6.10 would be taken as the first item on Thursday 19 June 2025.	
1	Calling of the Roll and Apologies for Absence Leisgeulan Apologies were intimated on behalf of Mr K Gowans and Mr A Mackintosh on 18 June 2025 and Mr K Gowans, Mrs I MacKenzie, Mr A Mackintosh and Mr D MacPherson on 19 June 2025.	n/a
2	Declarations of Interest Foillseachaidhean Com-pàirt None.	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 14 May 2025 which was APPROVED.	n/a
4	Major Development Update Iartasan Mòra	
	There had been circulated Report No PLS/30/25 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.	PW
7	In terms of Standing Order 9 the Committee agreed to consider item 7.1 at this stage. Decision of the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit	
7.1	Additional Urgent Item - Skye Reinforcement Section 37 Determination The Committee NOTED the decision of the Scottish Ministers to grant energy consent and deemed planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the Decision Notice.	
5	Major Developments – Pre-application consultations	

	Leasachaidhean Mòra – Co-chomhairle Ro-iarrtais	
	There had been circulated report No PLS/31/25 by the Area Planning Manager – South.	
	The Committee NOTED the current pre-application notices.	
6	Planning Applications to be Determined Iarrtasan Dealbhaidh rin Dearbhadh	
6.1	<p>Applicant: Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc (24/01235/FUL) (PLS/32/25)</p> <p>Location: Land 380M SW Of Deanie Power Station, Deanie, Strathfarrar, Kiltarlity (Ward 12)</p> <p>Nature of Development: Deanie Substation - construction and operation of a 132kV replacement substation, platform, plant and machinery, access, laydown/work compound area(s), drainage, landscaping, and other ancillary works.</p> <p>Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>The application was subject to a pre-determination hearing, the procedure for which had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>As part of the Hearing process, the applicant's representatives summarised their application during their allotted ten-minute slot, then responded to questions from Members on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the pro-active management of traffic and noise in the area during the construction period had been undertaken, including adjustments to the hours of operation following feedback from Environmental Health; • a suggestion had been made to create a regularly updated flow chart to illustrate all projects and predicted traffic movements, enabling the monitoring of the total number of vehicles passing through the area; • it had been confirmed that road requirements stipulated by Planning to ensure safety would not be influenced by cost considerations; • assurances had been provided that woodland management would be monitored for the first 5–10 years, including the erection of deer fencing; • Condition 18, relating to the private water supply, had been addressed to ensure the maintenance of both quantity and quality, and it was envisaged that this would become a standard condition for all future projects; and • a liaison group had been proposed to facilitate local feedback and to ensure that funding from the Community Benefit Fund would be directed towards initiatives that benefit the local community. <p>The Chair sought and received confirmation from the applicant's representatives that they were satisfied with the manner in which the Hearing had been conducted.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Planning Officer- presented the application, he advised Committee of minor errors contained within the report which he corrected, and Members asked further questions on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attention had been given to road-related issues, including the section of the A31 from Cannich to Balblair, which was frequently closed due to fallen trees. It was noted that local villagers had been efficient in clearing 	MF

	<p>these obstructions. There was a recognised need to raise awareness of the frequency of such incidents and their potential impact;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the requirement to examine potential traffic issues and identify appropriate mitigation measures had been acknowledged; • it had been proposed that a traffic model be developed for the entire Aird area to enable planners to visualise changes in project timescales; • consideration had been given to the available proposals and the capacity to manage the project effectively; and • overall, Members had expressed satisfaction with the proposal. 	
	<p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report with the amendment of Condition 11(i) to require the Construction Traffic Management Plan to take account of all base line traffic flows and concurrent construction traffic impacts from other consented traffic generating proposals, including logging activity, on all publicly adopted roads within the transport study area identified within the Environmental Impact Assessment, with final wording of the conditions to be completed being delegated to the Area Planning Manager (South).</p>	
6.2	<p>Applicant: Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc (24/01234/FUL) (PLS/33/25) Location: Culligran Power Station, Strathfarrar, Kiltarlity (Ward 12). Nature of Development: Culligran Substation - construction and operation of a 132kV replacement substation, platform, plant and machinery, access, laydown/work compound area(s), drainage, landscaping, and other. Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>The application was subject to a pre-determination hearing, the procedure for which had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>As part of the Hearing process, the applicant's representatives summarised their application during their allotted ten-minute slot, then responded to questions from Members on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the pro-active management of traffic and noise in the area during the construction period had been undertaken, including adjustments to the hours of operation following feedback from Environmental Health; • a suggestion had been made to create a regularly updated flow chart to illustrate all projects and predicted traffic movements, enabling the monitoring of the total number of vehicles passing through the area; • it had been confirmed that road requirements stipulated by Planning to ensure safety would not be influenced by cost considerations; • assurances had been provided that woodland management would be monitored for the first 5–10 years, including the erection of deer fencing; • Condition 18, relating to the private water supply, had been addressed to ensure the maintenance of both quantity and quality, and it was envisaged that this would become a standard condition for all future projects; and • a liaison group had been proposed to facilitate local feedback and to ensure that funding from the Community Benefit Fund would be directed towards initiatives that benefit the local community regarding the size of the construction area outside the site, confirmation had been sought as to whether this area could still be used for recreational purposes; • clarification had been requested on the volume of mature trees that would be lost as a result of the project; • questions had been raised regarding the compound and the holding area 	MF

	<p>for HGV traffic, specifically whether this would be a single designated area rather than a combination of multiple sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it was confirmed that the Deanie and Culligan projects would proceed in parallel, with the Kilmorack project commencing on a staggered basis; • confirmation had been requested on the residual effects on water, and whether these could be mitigated through an alternative design that retained the natural waterbed and, consequently, the natural watercourse; • it had been noted that the footprint of the new site was larger than that of the original plan, and a query had been raised as to whether this could be reduced; and • a request had been made to consider whether the biodiversity net gain could be implemented sooner than 18 months following the completion of the development. <p>The Chair sought and received confirmation from the applicant's representatives that they were satisfied with the manner in which the Hearing had been conducted.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Planning Officer presented the application, and Members asked further questions on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members confirmed the amendments agreed to the condition covering Construction Traffic Management Plan for the Deanie Power Station could be included in this application; • it had been encouraged that projects be designed to be as small as possible, with a minimal footprint; and • the wording of paragraph 8.27 had been proposed to be revised and formalised as a condition, to ensure that residual effects on the watercourse were minimised. 	
	<p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report with the amendment to the wording of Condition 13.i to take account of all baseline traffic flows and concurrent construction traffic impacts from other consented traffic generating proposals, including logging activity, on all publicly adopted roads within the transport study area identified within the Environmental Impact Assessment, and an additional condition to ensure the applicant reduces the residual effect on the water course, with final wording of the conditions delegated to the Area Planning Manager (South).</p>	
6.3	<p>Applicant: Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission (24/02831/FUL) (PLS/34/25) Location: Land 100M NE of Caulternich, Kilmorack, Beaully (Ward 12). Nature of Development: Kilmorack Substation - construction and operation of a 132kV replacement substation, platform, plant and machinery, access, laydown/work compound area(s), drainage, landscaping, and other ancillary works. Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>The application was subject to a pre-determination hearing, the procedure for which had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>As part of the Hearing process, the applicant's representatives summarised their application during their allotted ten-minute slot, then responded to questions from Members on the following topics:</p>	MF

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concerns had been raised regarding traffic through Wester Balblair, noting that a shorter alternative route was available. It was queried whether restrictions could be placed on construction staff to prevent use of this route; • the pro-active management of traffic and noise monitoring during the construction period had been highlighted, with emphasis on establishing a clear baseline to address any issues that might arise. This included monitoring hours of operation and ensuring a prompt resolution to any breaches; • enquiries had been made regarding the current Kilmorack substation, specifically whether it would be decommissioned or operate concurrently with a new facility, and if so, for what duration; <p>Thereafter, the Clerk read out a statement from residents who had objected to the planning application, which had been submitted in accordance with the pre-determination hearing procedure, and this statement was acknowledged by Members.</p> <p>The Chair sought and received confirmation from the applicant's representatives that they were satisfied with the manner in which the Hearing had been conducted.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Planning Officer presented the application, and Members asked further questions on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it had been suggested that the trees on the southern boundary could be strengthened through a planning condition to provide additional screening of the site; • clarification had been sought as to whether the use of a temporary road would allow adequate visibility for other vehicles using the route; • questions had been raised regarding the working hours and whether any strengthening of the conditions was required; • it had been queried why a contribution to public art had not been included as part of the project; and • the need for improvements relating to active travel had been highlighted. 	
	<p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report and an amended Condition 11(i) to require the Construction Traffic Management Plan to take account of all base line traffic flows and concurrent construction traffic impacts from other consented traffic generating proposals, including logging activity, on all publicly adopted roads within the transport study area; a additional condition relating to a public artwork strategy as identified within the Environmental Statement; and the inclusion of an advisory note relating to construction working hours with final wording of the conditions and the advisory to be delegated to the Area Planning Manager (South).</p>	
6.4	<p>Applicant: Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc (24/01732/S37) (PLS/35/25) Location: Land 10KM NW Of Coul Farm House, Laggan (Ward 20). Nature of Development: Melgarve cluster project - Section 37 application under the Electricity Act for the installation and operation of approximately 7 km of 132 kV overhead line on double circuit steel structure towers, and ancillary development comprising 2 no. cable sealing end compounds,</p>	PW

	<p>approximately 9.9 km of underground cable (7.3 km from the Dell Wind Farm on site substation, 1.8 km from the Cloiche Wind Farm on site substation and 0.8 km on approach into Melgarve substation), upgrades to existing access tracks, new permanent and temporary access tracks, and temporary working areas.</p> <p>Recommendation: RAISE NO OBJECTION</p> <p>The Planning Officer introduced the application, for which the Council was a consultee. He explained that this application had previously been deferred from an earlier meeting of the Committee to allow for the NatureScot objection to be resolved. He also confirmed that there was an error in the front page of the report and clarified that the proposal did accord with the principles and policies of the Development Plan and it was acceptable in terms of material considerations. During discussion of the application Members had been content to agree with the conditions laid out in the report Disappointment was expressed in the consultation response by Transport Scotland regarding the impact of the development, and others, on the A86 and A89 and the mitigation the Committee considered was required.</p>	
	<p>Agreed: to RAISE NO OBJECTION to the application and the conditions listed in the report be submitted to the Energy Consents Unit, and that the Area Planning Manager (South) write to Transport Scotland highlighting the concerns raised by the Committee regarding the A86 and A89.</p>	
6.5	<p>Applicant: Robertson Homes Limited (24/01297/PIP) (PLS/36/25)</p> <p>Location: Westercraigs 9 and 10, Land South of Kirkwall Brae, Inverness (Ward 13).</p> <p>Nature of Development: Erection of 380 residential units with access, landscaping, public open space, drainage, infrastructure and associated works.</p> <p>Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>The Planning Officer introduced the application. He advised that amendments were required to condition 7 and 8 within the report, and that two additional conditions were required. These amendments and additions are as follows:</p> <p>Amended Condition 7: Leachkin Road/Kirkwall Brae Junction</p> <p>7. No development shall start on site until a Road Design Scheme for the junction of Leachkin Road with Kirkwall Brae is submitted and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority. This Scheme will include the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a Community Engagement Process to confirm the consultation process with local residents and stakeholders. • a Road Safety Audit process for the proposed road scheme (Stages 1 through 4) and any required remedial works agreed and implemented • A post-implementation monitoring plan to assess the performance of the road scheme for a minimum of 12 months following occupation of any dwelling in each phase or sub-phase of the development, with provisions for remedial measures if adverse impacts are identified. <p>The approved road scheme shall be constructed and operational to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority prior to the first occupation of any part of the development.</p>	KG

Reason: In the interests of road traffic safety

Amended Condition 8: Telford Street Corridor

8. No development shall start on site until a scheme of mitigation shall have been submitted for the approval in writing of the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority detailing measures to mitigate the anticipated increase in traffic resulting from this development on Telford Street. These measures shall include:

- The conversion of Carsegate Road/Telford Street roundabout into a signalised four-way junction as per the Muirtown and South Kessock Development Brief
- The installation of green wave technology along the Telford Street Corridor to manage peak traffic
- Changes to Telford Road junction to permit two continuous traffic lanes inbound into Inverness and a single outbound lane
- Changes to the Canal Road junction to alter slip lanes and reconfigure the junction
- Provide measures such as a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in Merkinch to prevent an increase in rat running

The agreed scheme shall be implemented by the developer to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority prior to the first occupation of any part of the development.

Reason: In the interests of road traffic safety as these options are intended to ensure that the Telford Street corridor and wider network remains safe and efficient as the development progresses.

Additional Conditions:

A82 Roundabout at Telford Street

30. No development shall start on site until a detailed design for the modifications to the existing roundabout at A82 on Telford Street has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority and Transport Scotland. The approved scheme shall be subject to a full Road Safety Audit (Stages 1 and 2) and the agreed scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any dwelling in each phase or sub-phase of the development.

Reason: In the interests of road traffic safety

31. Upon completion of the works in relation to the approved scheme, a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit shall be undertaken to monitor the performance of the modified roundabout at A82 on Telford Street for a period of 12 months following first occupation of any dwelling in each phase or sub-phase of the development, including traffic flow, queue lengths and safety performance. A Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the Planning Authority, in consultation with the Roads Authority and Transport Scotland, within 14 months of first occupation of any dwelling in each phase or sub-phase of the development and the developer shall submit a scheme of mitigation for approval and implement the agreed measures within a timescale to be agreed with the Planning Authority.

Reason: To monitor the proposed new road markings and signing on Telford Street and changes to the circulatory road markings on the Trunk Road

	<p>During discussion, information had been sought and provided regarding the proposed addition of the bus gate to the development. Discussion had taken place around the bus gate usage and whether it would be available to the emergency services, which had been confirmed. Concern had been expressed about this route being used as a shortcut through the housing estate by local people; however, it had been confirmed that a control barrier would be in place to mitigate this. Concerns had also been expressed about the lack of green play spaces for children. Members had sought assurances that the public art would be more than just a bench, stipulating that a percentage of the cost could be allocated to public art or ensuring that the public art would be something more substantial.</p> <p>Motion: Mr Graham, seconded by Mr Gregson, moved to grant planning permission in principle subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Agreement in line with officer recommendations subject to amending the words of condition 10 to read “an access for emergency services, details of which shall be agreed to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority” and the inclusion of the amended condition 7 & 8, and additional conditions 30 and 31 as stated by the Planner.</p> <p>Amendment: Mr Oldham, seconded by Mr Lobban, moved an amendment to grant planning permission in principle to the conclusion of a Section 75 Agreement in line with officer recommendations as set out in the report, and the inclusion of the amended condition 7 & 8, and the additional conditions 30 and 31 as stated by the Planner.</p> <p>On the vote being taken there were 3 votes for the motion and 11 votes for the amendment with no abstention.</p> <p>The amendment was therefore carried; the votes having been cast as follows:-</p> <p>For the Motion: - Mr A Graham, Mr M Gregson, Ms M Reid.</p> <p>For the Amendment: - Mr C Ballance, Mr D Fraser, Mr L Fraser, Mr R Jones, Mr B Lobban, Mrs I MacKenzie, Mr T MacLennan, Mr D Macpherson, Mr P Oldham, Ms L Saggars, and Ms K Willis.</p>	
	<p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission in principle subject to the conditions detailed in the report and the conclusion of a Section 75 Agreement in line with officer recommendations as set out in the report, and the inclusion of the amended condition 7 & 8, and the additional conditions 30 and 31 as stated by the Planner.</p>	
6.6	<p>Applicant: West Fraser Europe Ltd (24/05253/FUL) (PLS/37/25) Location: Land 870M NE Of Norbord Europe Ltd, Dalcross (Ward 17) Nature of Development: Construction of a rail sidings yard including new rail sidings and connection to the main line, associated gantry crane (and/or reach-stackers), areas of hard standing, access road, vehicle parking, fencing, drainage, landscaping and associated infrastructure works and facilities. Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>The Planning Officer introduce the application. He explained that additional conditions to those in the report were requested by Environmental Health.</p>	JK

	<p>These were:</p> <p>a) Operations associated with this development for which noise is audible at the curtilage of any noise sensitive property shall be restricted to the following times unless otherwise agreed by the Planning Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mon-Sat; 07:00-19:00 for train movements. • Mon-Sat; 08:00-20:00 for loading and unloading of containers and all other operations <p>b) Revised Noise Impact Assessment – demonstrating that noise arising from this development will not have an adverse impact on existing noise sensitive properties.</p> <p>Information was sought and provided regarding the loading and unloading of containers. It was confirmed only one train would be arriving and departing daily; however, it was noted this may increase to a maximum of two trains per day in future.</p> <p>Discussion took place concerning the proposed operating hours. There had been general support that the proposed operating hours be reduced given the proximity of noise sensitive receptors. Members welcomed the shift from road-based operations using heavy goods vehicles to rail-based transport, recognising the associated environmental and logistical benefits.</p> <p>Clarification had been requested regarding the felling of woodland in relation to biodiversity net gain. It was explained any tree removal would be compensated on a like-for-like basis, with replanting to take place within the boundaries of the approved landscaping plan.</p>	
	<p>Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions detailed in the report with amendments to Conditions 6 (CEMP to include construction noise mitigation scheme) and 7 (lighting scheme to include a revised lighting impact assessment) and the two additional conditions 18 and 19, with an amended time for both train movements and loading and unloading of containers and all other operations on Saturdays, being 0800 – 1300 hours.</p>	
6.7	<p>Applicant: JLC Estates Ltd (23/02189/FUL) (PLS/38/25)</p> <p>Location: Land 50M NW of Mehalah Tirindrish, Spean Bridge (Ward 11).</p> <p>Nature of Development: Erection of 12 houses (including 4 affordable cottage flats), improvement of existing access and erection of farm shop.</p> <p>Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>Members questioned whether the farm shop currently had a tenant or whether the building would remain unoccupied upon completion.</p> <p>Clarification had been sought regarding the provision of covered bicycle storage and electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities. It was confirmed covered bicycle storage had been included in the plans.</p> <p>Motion: - Ms L Saggars, seconded by Mr P Oldham, moved to grant planning permission subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Agreement and the conditions as laid out in the report.</p> <p>Amendment: - Ms K Willis, seconded by Mr C Ballance, moved an amendment to grant planning permission subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Agreement and the conditions laid out in the report with an</p>	LP

	<p>additional condition requiring the installation of an electric vehicle (EV) charger for the farm shop.</p> <p>On the vote being taken there were 7 votes for the motion and 7 votes for the amendment with no abstentions, the Chair using his casting vote in favour of the Motion.</p> <p>The motion was therefore carried, the votes having been cast as follows:-</p> <p>For the Motion: - Mr L Fraser, Mr R Jones, Mr B Lobban, Mrs I MacKenzie, Mr T MacLennan, Mr P Oldham, and Ms L Siggers.</p> <p>For the Amendment: - Mr C Ballance, Mr D Fraser, Mr A Graham, Mr M Gregson, Mr D MacPherson, Ms M Reid, and Ms K Willis.</p>	
	Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Agreement and the conditions as laid out in the report.	
6.8	<p>Applicant: Community Sauna Highland (25/00574/FUL) (PLS/39/25) Location: Land 75M SE of Tennis Pavilion, Bellfield Park, Island Bank Road, Inverness (Ward 14). Nature of Development: Erection of sauna and office. Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>Following discussion, Members were content with the conditions as laid out in the report, which included staff being present during operating hours, toilet facilities being made available, tree protection measures, and a requirement for the operators to include appropriate cycling provision to encourage people to cycle rather than drive to the facility.</p>	EW
	Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report with the additional condition on cycle parking provisions with the final wording of the conditions delegated to the Area Planning Manager (South).	
6.9	<p>Applicant: Mr H Malik (25/00684/FUL) (PLS/40/25) Location: Unit 1, Culduthel Avenue, Inverness, IV2 6JG (Ward 15) Nature of Development: Change of use from Class 3 (food and drink) to Class 3 (food and drink) and hot food take away, installation of extract flue. Recommendation: GRANT</p> <p>Following the discussion, the operating hours were queried, and Members were advised the operating hours would be to 11.00pm. Assurances were sought to ensure these did not preclude the takeaway hours; however, it was advised Condition 2 had been included to ensure hot food takeaway could not continue after the café had closed. The availability of waste facilities was discussed, and Members were advised of commercial bins situated to the rear of the property, with public bins available to the side within the car park of the facility. Members agreed this was an acceptable use of an existing facility.</p>	JAB
	Agreed: to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report.	
	The meeting ended at 4.45pm on 18 June 2025 and continued at 9.30am on Thursday 19 June 2025.	

6.10	<p>Applicant: Loch Kemp Storage Ltd (23/06025/S36) (PLS/41/25) Location: Land 1300m SW of Dell Lodge, Whitebridge. (Ward 12). Nature of Development: Construction and operation of pumped hydro storage; dam, raise, and utilise Loch Kemp, as its upper reservoir, and connect by underground waterway systems and tunnels to a powerhouse and tailrace structure on the shores of Loch Ness. Recommendation: RAISE NO OBJECTIONS</p> <p>The Planner introduced the report and explained since the report had been published the following updates were required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • three late representations had been received; • there had been an objection from the Strathnairn Community Council; and • a number of minor or technical adjustments to the Report of Handling had been required as a result. <p>Information was sought and provided on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic and road volumes and impact; • noise pollution; • environmental impacts during construction phase • monitoring of pumping rates • flood prevention • thermal instability of Loch Ness • decommissioning • private water supplies <p>Motion: Mr C Ballance seconded by Mr D Fraser moved to RAISE AN OBJECTION to this application because it does not accord with the provisions of s36 of the Electricity Act 1989 by not demonstrating sufficient regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty, of conserving flora, fauna and geological or physiographical features of special interest and of protecting sites of interest, and neither does it reasonably mitigate against the detrimental effects of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposed development would have significant adverse effects on the special qualities of the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA and the underlying LCTs which make up its special qualities; and it has a significant adverse impact on recreational receptors on Loch Ness and the Great Glen. This is contrary to NPF4 Policies 11 (Energy) and 4 (Natural Places) and HwLDP Policies 57 (Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage) and 67 (Renewable Energy Developments)</p> <p>The location, siting, scale, massing and design of the powerhouse is not appropriate for development on the shore of Loch Ness, contrary to HwLDP Policy 29 (Design Quality and Place Making).</p> <p>The loss of ancient woodland is not acceptable, and the proposed compensatory planting is not suitable mitigation for the loss. The significant adverse effects of the proposed development on the qualities of the Ness Wood SAC, the Easter Ness Forest SSSI, and the Urquhart Bay Woods SSSI are not clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits contrary to NPF4 Policy 4 (Natural Places) and Policy 6 (Forestry, woodland and trees) and HwLDP Policy 52 (Principle of Development in Woodland).</p> <p>The development proposal and the creation of 25 jobs does not demonstrate that it maximises net economic impact or socio-economic benefits due to a lack of analysis on the impact of tourism and surrounding businesses on Loch Ness contrary to NPF4 Policy 11 (c) (Energy) and Inner Moray Firth LDP2 given the suitability of Loch Ness for tourism growth.</p>	RD
------	--	----

	<p>The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the local road infrastructure, including the B851 and B862, and the mitigation proposed does not adequately address these impacts, contrary to NPF4 Policy 18 (b) (Infrastructure First) and HwLDP Policy 28 (Sustainable Design). None of these concerns are outweighed by the economic benefits of this development or the contribution it will make to the country's net zero targets and it fails to strengthen nature networks and the connections between them as required by NPF4 Policy 3 (Biodiversity)</p> <p>Amendment: Mr B Lobban, seconded by Mr T MacLennan, raised no objection in line with officer recommendations subject to an amendment to condition 42(a) to include the word "hydro" between the words "pumped" and "storage".</p> <p>On a vote being taken there were 8 votes for the motion and 2 votes for the amendment with no abstentions.</p> <p>The motion was therefore carried, the votes having been cast as follows:-</p> <p>For the Motion:- Mr C Ballance, Mr D Fraser, Mr A Graham, Mr M Gregson, Mr R Jones, Mr P Oldham, Ms L Sagers, and Ms K Willis.</p> <p>For the Amendment:- Mr B Lobban, and Mr T MacLennan.</p>	
	<p>Agreed: to RAISE AN OBJECTION to this application because it does not accord with the provisions of s36 of the Electricity Act 1989 by not demonstrating sufficient regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty, of conserving flora, fauna and geological or physiographical features of special interest and of protecting sites of interest, and neither does it reasonably mitigate against the detrimental effects of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposed development would have significant adverse effects on the special qualities of the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA and the underlying LCTs which make up its special qualities; and it has a significant adverse impact on recreational receptors on Loch Ness and the Great Glen. This is contrary to NPF4 Policies 11 (Energy) and 4 (Natural Places) and HwLDP Policies 57 (Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage) and 67 (Renewable Energy Developments)</p> <p>The location, siting, scale, massing and design of the powerhouse is not appropriate for development on the shore of Loch Ness, contrary to HwLDP Policy 29 (Design Quality and Place Making).</p> <p>The loss of ancient woodland is not acceptable, and the proposed compensatory planting is not suitable mitigation for the loss. The significant adverse effects of the proposed development on the qualities of the Ness Wood SAC, the Easter Ness Forest SSSI, and the Urquhart Bay Woods SSSI are not clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits contrary to NPF4 Policy 4 (Natural Places) and Policy 6 (Forestry, woodland and trees) and HwLDP Policy 52 (Principle of Development in Woodland).</p> <p>The development proposal and the creation of 25 jobs does not demonstrate that it maximises net economic impact or socio-economic benefits due to a lack of analysis on the impact of tourism and surrounding businesses on Loch Ness contrary to NPF4 Policy 11 (c) (Energy) and Inner Moray Firth LDP2 given the suitability of Loch Ness for tourism growth.</p> <p>The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the local road infrastructure, including the B851 and B862, and the mitigation proposed does not adequately address these impacts, contrary to NPF4 Policy 18 (b) (Infrastructure First) and HwLDP Policy 28 (Sustainable Design).</p>	

	None of these concerns are outweighed by the economic benefits of this development or the contribution it will make to the country's net zero targets and it fails to strengthen nature networks and the connections between them as required by NPF4 Policy 3 (Biodiversity).	
	The meeting ended at 3.30pm on 19 June 2025.	