

Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council

MINUTES for Wednesday 7th January 2026 by Zoom

Minutes

Item		Action by
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies <u>Committee:</u> Theo Stratton (Chair) TS; Bob Latimer (Treasurer) BL; Jo-Anne Pugh (Sec) JP; Heather Alexander HA; Ann Jefferson AJ; Susan Munro SM; Anne Phillips AP; Kerry Ward KW. <u>Ex-Officio:</u> Cllr Lyndsey Johnston LJ Andy Dorin (RAFT) AD (to item 2) <u>Residents:</u> Graham Clydesdale GC; Matthew Locke ML; Pamela Masden PM; Stephen Rhodes SR. <u>Apologies:</u> None</p> <p>The Chair welcomed members of the public and proposed to move Planning matters to the start of the meeting. This was agreed. Presentation by Rosefort CIC has been moved to the February meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting The minutes of 3/12/25 were approved. Proposed AP, seconded AJ.</p>	
7 7.1	<p>Planning NB LJ took no part in this section. <u>House, 25m west of 3 Canonbury Terrace, Fortrose:</u> TS noted that the applicant, ML, had addressed FRCC's May meeting, adding the application was now live and within Fortrose conservation area. The applicant and two neighbours were invited to speak. ML said THC's conservation officer had encouraged a sympathetic modern design using traditional materials. Talks were ongoing with THC's roads department regarding access concerns. GC, an immediate neighbour, said he had objected to the application as the site was not suitable in terms of shape, topography, size nor location. He felt it overshadowed his home. He felt that the stability of his house and Canonbury Terrace might be compromised by the deep excavations required. Construction vehicles/equipment could not be accommodated on site and he said major disruption to nearby traffic was likely for a substantial period. He also noted the plan to include two wind turbines on top of the property. SR, another neighbour, said he planned to object on similar grounds. He was particularly concerned about the extent to which the applicant had undertaken geo-technical investigations to establish that excavations would not cause subsidence to the A832 or nearby properties. He also expressed concern over the visual impact of 24 solar panels and two wind turbines, and the significant disruption to traffic during construction. He commended the design overall but felt it was too ambitious for the plot size and location. TS invited comments from FRCC members. JP and AP commended the design but shared concerns over construction issues and traffic disruption. ML said that the design was</p>	

7.2	<p>low-profile to respect neighbours' light and view. A site investigation by a local qualified engineer had involved soil penetration tests which suggested the ground was stable to a 45 degree angle of repose. Construction traffic would be minimised by much of the build taking place off site and vehicles would use St Andrews Walk rather than the main road. It was envisaged that the work would start in summer to minimise subsidence issues during construction. He said the footprint of the house was actually a smaller percentage of the site than next door and the building materials were similar to those of nearby properties. No property on St Andrews Walk would meet modern visibility splay requirements for vehicle exit, so he proposed a video system linked to the garage door opening to enable a safe exit. The traffic speed is naturally slow on St Andrews Walk and traffic is light. The proposed pedestrian access to Canonbury Terrace would be an improvement, in terms of safety, to the existing gate. Regarding solar panels and wind turbines, the intention was to make the house carbon neutral with zero external energy consumption. The solar panels faced away from Canonbury Terrace. The turbines would be 1m high and 400mm in diameter so very small, but if this was a major issue he was willing to remove them from the plan. He envisaged construction would take 6-9 months, depending on the weather. SR asked about documentation regarding ground-bearing suitability. ML said tests indicated a soft sandstone base below 750mm top soil. Excavation would involve digging not drilling. ML said the site investigation met THC planning requirements but he would provide more details to the planning portal for examination. He pointed out that planning permission would depend on a building warrant being issued by the THC, which would require protection of Canonbury Terrace and neighbouring properties during construction. GC said the THC Roads dept would not support the application due to vehicle visibility issues. ML said discussions were continuing on this. He said that cars would be able to continue to use St Andrew's walk during construction. He added that permitted work to remove dangerous trees on the site had taken place. GC noted that other neighbours shared his concerns, as did a number of residents via Facebook. It was agreed by FRCC members that there were no issues regarding the concept or design but there were concerns regarding site stability and traffic issues. It was noted that THC would only consider FRCC's views if an objection was lodged, rather than a comment. ML pointed out that objections need to be based on planning framework not technical aspects. Nonetheless, it was agreed by majority vote (6 wishing to object with 2 abstentions) that TS would submit an objection to THC based on the discussion above by the deadline of 11/1/26.</p> <p><u>Amendments to house plan, Wester Mountpleasant, Fortrose:</u> No comments.</p>	
3 3.1 3.2	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting - Matters Arising</p> <p><u>Phone Box:</u> HA liaising with Black Isle Men's Shed (BIMS) regarding refurbishment in Spring. JP to move item to 'on-going' list.</p> <p><u>Storage shed refurbishment:</u> It was agreed that BL would seek quotes for door/frame and other essential repairs to the George V playing field shed and three of the St Boniface stalls.</p>	JP BL

<p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p> <p>3.8</p>	<p><u>Committee Room furniture</u>: TS to check this has been added to the new Common Good asset register when published. LJ said that THC was planning to have both the furniture and the Chain of Office valued, at the cost of around £400 (paid for by the Common Good fund). It was agreed that the furniture valuation should ideally take place after FRCC/BIMS volunteers had completed restoration work, likely by April. LJ to inform Ward Manager. AP pointed out that FRCC had, for a number of years, paid for insurance for the Chain of Office which one now assumed had actually been covered by THC policies.</p> <p><u>Tree survey</u>: JP said that following correspondence, THC Arboriculture Officer had been invited to speak to the Black Isle Ward Councillors at the next Ward meeting. JP asked for LJ to pursue this and report back.</p> <p><u>Benches</u>: Deferred to future meeting when an update from JP is available.</p> <p><u>Winter resilience sub-committee</u>: SM had circulated a Scope of Work and Action Plan, which was agreed by FRCC. SM and the group were thanked for the significant progress that had been made, which included liaising with key agencies and other groups and identifying key risks (transport links, power outages/communication failures, vulnerable people and community engagement). SM thanked HA for updating the FRCC website which now contained useful information for residents. A Third Sector resilience training opportunity had been identified, and meetings with the local Emergency Planning Officer and with possible local “warm hub” venues were planned. The practicality/cost of accessing an emergency generator for the community was being explored. Work would continue to identify community consultation, communication and engagement strategies along with a plan for implementation. TS to link SM with Avoch and Killen CC who wished to develop a similar plan. TS felt the group’s work may end up as an exemplary model for many CCs.</p> <p><u>Station Road car park</u>: JP had sent photos and emails as requested to THC. Relevant officials are expected to attend the next Black Isle Ward meeting with councillors to discuss. LJ asked to report back.</p> <p><u>Slog footpath, Rosemarkie</u>: David Grigor had agreed to provide an estimated cost for manufacturing and fitting a handrail. JP to liaise.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>LJ</p> <p>LJ</p> <p>JP</p> <p>LJ</p> <p>JP</p>
<p>4</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p>Points from public/correspondence</p> <p><u>Manhole cover, Fortrose</u>: JP continued to pursue correspondence with concerned neighbours, Scottish Water and the likely owner of the dangerously loose manhole cover on a public footpath. JP had contacted THC for advice - details to be sent to LJ.</p>	<p>JP/LJ</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Treasurer’s Report</p> <p>BL reported that the total balance stood at £7476.18. The income from the “Carols and Christmas Songs” on Christmas Eve was £1270.44 (a substantial and impressive increase on the previous year) with associated expenses at £60.67. The Committee congratulated AP and all the volunteers who made the event such a success. It was agreed that £800 would be donated to the identified main beneficiary, Black Isle Needs To Play, £100 to the Hairy Piper (who piped in aid of Poppy Scotland), and £100 would be given to the musicians in recognition of their services and for use of their technical equipment. AP to supply bank details to BL for</p>	

	payment.	AP/BL
6	Community issues/consultations	
6.1	<u>Moray FLOW-park</u> : TS said that no Black Isle CC (BICC), with the exception of Avoch & Killen, had responded to his enquiries regarding shared concerns. Moray Firth Coastal Partnership had replied, however, and invited FRCC to join their organisation - a charitable enterprise which has as its objective to work for a “sustainable future for the Moray Firth and its communities”. It was agreed that FRCC should join - TS to action.	TS
6.2	<u>Matters of Public Interest</u> : Discussion deferred to next meeting.	
6.3	<u>Water safety</u> : Deferred to next meeting.	
8	Licensing No reports.	
9	Police Report None received. TS to circulate when available. Next quarterly meeting, online, due 13/1/26. TS and AP to attend.	TS
10	Community groups/meetings	
10.1	<u>Carols and Xmas lights debrief</u> : AP to circulate notes after next sub-committee meeting, which is a debrief of the event. Comments next meeting.	AP
10.2	<u>Developer contributions</u> : BICC representatives had been invited to attend a meeting hosted by Ward Councillors to discuss THC policy. TS to accept.	TS
11	Any Other Business	
11.1	<u>FRCC Constitution</u> : HA had circulated details of the new Scheme of Establishment for community councils. It was formally adopted (proposed by HA, seconded by JP). HA to upload to FRCC website. Actions arising to be discussed at next meeting.	HA
11.2	<u>FRCC monthly meeting agenda</u> : It was agreed that the standing items on the agenda needed to be revised to incorporate events, sub-committees’ work and on-going issues. JP to draft template and circulate. TS reminded all that specific agenda items needed to be submitted more than 7 days in advance of a meeting, and should be emailed to the Chair and the Secretary.	JP
11.3	<u>FRCC meeting locations</u> : Deferred to next meeting.	
12	Date of Next Meeting Wednesday 4th February 2026 via Zoom.	