

Beauly Primary Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes

Meeting No. 13

Microsoft Teams

3 November 2025 at 5:45 pm

Present:		
Stakeholders		
Jenny English	Parent Council	JE
Siobhan Greiger	Parent Council	SG
Deirdre Murray	Parent Council	DM
Catherine Rait	Parent Council	CR
Donna Forbes	Beauly Toddler Group	DFo
Seona Fraser	Beauly Community Council	SF
Jane Cumming	Beauly & Kilmorack Community Trust	JC
David Cameron	Senior Case Worker for Kate Forbes MSP	DC
Councillors		
Chris Ballance		CB
Helen Crawford		HC
David Fraser, Chair		DF
Emma Knox		EK
Highland Council		
Lyndsay Bradley	Acting Area Quality Improvement Manager	LB
Robert Campbell	Service Lead Capital Planning & Estate Strategy	RC
Tracey Fraser-Lee	Head Teacher, Beauly Primary School	TFL
Dorothy Gibb	Team Leader, THC Estates Team	DG
Carol Lobban	Operations Manager, Facilities Management	CL
Fiona Sangster	Estates Co-ordinator	FS
Simon Swanson	Head of Investment & Programme Management High Life Highland	SS
Apologies		
Suzie Lockett	Teacher, Beauly Primary School	
Aileen Snowie	Facilities Management Officer	

<p>1. RECORDING OF MEETING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DF informed the group that the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of the minutes. 	
<p>2. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DF welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies – Suzie Lockett, Aileen Snowie. 	
<p>3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved. 	
<p>4. SITE OPTIONS / MASTERPLAN / PROCUREMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC apologised for delaying the stakeholder meeting but reassured the group that the key milestone of taking the decision to the Education Committee in November was still achievable. • RC shared presentation boards from the drop-in session in June and gave a brief summary of the progress so far on the project for a new school for the benefit of the new people attending the meeting. • He added that funding has been secured for a replacement school for Beaulay as a priority through the Highland Investment Plan with the building to be operational in 2028. • RC explained the process that had been undertaken to identify the preferred site option for the new school. • Sites identified in the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan had been considered as well as the existing school site. • Site investigations had been carried out and although all had challenges, none were significant. • Drop-in events had been held to gauge local opinion and although there was no clear favourite, BE04 had seemed more popular due to mid-village location. Research into current pupil addresses had supported that this site was closer to the majority of pupil homes. • Each site had been assessed to see what it would look like with the footprint of the school building on it and all had sufficient space for the school. • The inclusion of a POD where other services or partner agencies could co-locate had also been considered for each site. For Beaulay this would be on a small scale, unlike some other projects such as Dingwall and Thurso where larger buildings to house NHS or similar public sector bodies are being considered. • Existing buildings in the local area will also be looked at for accommodating other services etc. • RC explained that THC had been in dialogue with both landowners and were still finalising discussions. • A masterplan had been created to include a school site and also for future housing development land as feedback from public events had been that families had often been forced to leave Beaulay to find bigger homes for their growing families. • Proposed to secure 2 hectares for the school with up to 4 hectares identified for potential future housing which would not necessarily be THC housing but could be delivered by a private developer. 	

- RC informed the group that the THC recommendation is that BE04 is the preferred site for the school, with a masterplan showing the inclusion of potential land for housing adjacent to the site as well as on BE02.
- The West side of the site would provide more flexibility due to potential flooding issues on the East side that would be easier to deal with if building smaller footprint buildings such as housing.
- RC shared an image of the West site with the school situated on it.
- RC noted that what will happen to the existing school site will need to be discussed.
- DF confirmed that the West side of BE04 had been identified as the preferred site for the school.
- SG asked if the link road would be continued to connect to Croyard Road as part of the school build.
- RC responded that the road would only be extended as far as was required for the school but that it could be extended further if the housing development took place.
- SG raised concerns about all school traffic travelling in and out through The Braes and mentioned current issues at the existing school site despite two drop off areas at Croyard Road and at Braeview car park and added that residents of The Braes had mentioned concerns to her too.
- DG explained that she had met with the THC Transport Planner on site and although the junction to Priory Way is considered a busy one, it is not considered a problem one.
- RC added that a full traffic impact analysis will take place, but initial feedback was that there was nothing that couldn't be overcome. The school road layout will be designed carefully to keep traffic moving.
- DG added that there will also be a road safety audit by an external consultant.
- SG asked if a through road to Croyard Road would be a THC priority.
- DG replied that the land in between the proposed school site and Croyard Road is not in the ownership of THC and a through road is not required for the school build.
- RC noted that any future housing development would be phased so there would not be an immediate impact.
- JC noted that in community discussions with SSEN legacy housing had been mentioned and asked if that was something that might be pursued as a development on that site.
- RC replied that it could be although he was not aware of any discussions between SSEN and THC or the landowners.
- RC noted that THC will be going back to both landowners to confirm that the masterplan approach is supported so there will be the option for landowners to get together with SSEN.
- JC asked if there was a way of putting it into the system that a future developer would have to develop the road.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC replied that we can raise it for applications coming through but it would go through the planning process. • DF added that the expectation would be that as housing projects begin Planning would need to consider the road. • RC informed the group that a Statutory Consultation process requires to be carried out for a permanent change to a school such as a relocation and that Derek Martin would be working with Lyndsay Bradley on this for Beauly. • Robert presented a guide document for the Consultation Scotland Act and agreed to share it with the group. • If the report to the Education Committee stating the preferred site for the new school is approved on 19 November, the formal consultation period will be 1 December 2025 – 23 January 2023. This would include a formal public meeting during the week commencing 8 December. The final decision would be reported to the Education Committee at their meeting on 3 June and then hopefully ratified at the full Highland Council meeting on 25 June. • THC has engaged Hub North Scotland as a delivery partner for the seven HIP projects including the new Beauly Primary School on a design and build basis and they will appoint consultants and contractors on behalf of THC. • Hub North to be invited to the next Stakeholder meeting to update on progress and also to discuss Community Benefits. • THC have an in-house design already from the Broadford and Dunvegan Primary School projects and will continue to be engaged with that. • Touch down accommodation relating to the POD approach will be on the public side of building, not the educational area. • A drop-in event is planned for the wider public to coincide with the consultation public meeting. • RC noted that support had been agreed in principle for relocating the library to the new school and that the scope of leisure and sports facilities was still to be agreed. • DF asked if the project was still on track for 2028. • RC replied that yes, although some adjustment to the programme would be required once Hub North have completed their process, he was not expecting a delay beyond 2028. • DF asked if the formal consultation might cause a delay with the design and planning. • RC noted that this was unlikely because the building itself is largely designed based on Broadford and Dunvegan. • CB asked about the space for the POD area and if it would impact on green space for the school. • RC responded that there would not be a huge increase in the footprint and explained that there would be separate entrances for the school and the public areas. RC shared the footprints for Broadford and Dunvegan to demonstrate the layout. • SG asked at what point the land for the new school would be purchased. 	<p style="text-align: center;">RC</p>
--	---------------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC explained that a Heads of Terms would be agreed with the landowners and when the consultation had been decided and planning permission granted, the legal acquisition would take place. • JC mentioned that the Community Trust had been in discussions with SSEN about facilities they could provide in Beaulieu early in the SSEN project and later on and she was concerned about duplication on what might be provided in the new school building. • SS noted that HLH had been in discussion with SSEN as they are keen to leave legacy projects behind as their project progresses. They had mentioned the possibility of assisting with the inclusion of the library or a gym/fitness suite in the PODs. • SS suggested that the Broadford model was a good start. • RC added that the Phipps Hall and other locations needed to be considered too and suggested that a Steering Group was formed and he would be happy to attend any meetings. • JC to make contact with SS to discuss options for what to include. • HC asked JC if she had been talking to SSEN about the Phipps Hall or about the school. • JC confirmed that she had been in discussions with SSEN about the land beside the Phipps Hall currently owned by the Sports Association. • HC asked if SSEN had specifically indicated that they would give funding towards facilities at the school. • SS responded that SSEN had indicated that they were keen to give something to the community but had not specified what that could be or any particular sum of money. • RC suggested that a unified approach between all groups involved in Beaulieu was required to work together to get the best facilities. • JC explained that SSEN had indicated that they had different pots of money for different things – Health & Wellbeing for their staff fits in with the provision of gym facilities so could be provided early in their project. • DG agreed that SSEN’s contribution would come in two different stages – immediate projects such as the area of land JC had been discussing with them, and the school for legacy items. • DF agreed that the key to maximising this would be a unified approach but suggested that we did not want to delay the school build whilst conversations took place. 	
<p>5. Education/School Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TFL confirmed that the entrance drive to the school had been repaired over the October holiday period. • TFL shared concerns about the possibility of a Care Inspectorate inspection for the nursery soon and the fact that the nursery would still be in the same position as it was three years ago with no free flow and poor building conditions but 	

<p>noted that it was positive that things were moving forward and that better provision would be in place in the new school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DF noted that if an inspection did take place, the formal consultation to move the school would be underway and the Care Inspectorate will recognise that. 	
<p>6. AOCB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG raised the subject of after school provision and the trial activity EQ Sports had provided before the holidays. They had raised that the costs for the small hall at Beauly were the same as larger halls elsewhere but that the size had an impact on the numbers able to attend which had a financial impact on them. • RC was not aware of a formal approach from EQ Sports about the costs. • SG asked if it would be possible to offer a discount whilst at the current school to allow it to be financially feasible for future events to happen. Although the Phipps Hall was a larger venue, it was off the school site so not viable. • RC noted that there was a Council policy on let charges which didn't offer room for manoeuvre. • DF suggested SG got an indication of costs from EQ Sports and reported back to the four councillors to see if there was anything they could do. • The preferred meeting date for the public consultation meeting was agreed as 9 December 2025 at 7 pm in the Phipps Hall. FS to check availability. • Arrangements to be made to hold a public drop in event in the afternoon of the consultation meeting. • SS asked if the group were in agreement that the consultation to move the library from the Phipps Hall to the new school should also be progressed. • The group agreed that this should be taken forward. • SG asked if she could share the location of the preferred site with parents. • RC agreed that the information could be shared and agreed to provide slides to present to them at their next meeting. • DF expressed thanks to RC and his team for getting the project to this stage. 	<p>FS</p>
<p>7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC to check with Hub North on availability and programme before deciding on a date for the next meeting. 	<p>RC</p>