

**MINUTES of MEETING of the PLANNING, PROTECTIVE SERVICES AND LICENSING  
COMMITTEE held in the COLINTRAIVE VILLAGE HALL, COLINTRAIVE  
on TUESDAY, 28 MAY 2013**

**Present:** Councillor Sandy Taylor (Chair)

Councillor Rory Colville	Councillor Alex McNaughton
Councillor Robin Currie	Councillor James McQueen
Councillor Donald MacMillan	

**Attending:** Iain Jackson, Governance and Risk Manager  
Richard Kerr, Area Team Leader, Major Applications  
Mark Stewart, Marine and Coastal Manager  
Stewart McLelland, Applicant  
Mark Edmonds, Applicant  
Rebecca Dean, Applicant  
Michael Kaufmann, Colintraive and Glendaruel Community Council  
Craig MacIntyre, Argyll and District Salmon Fishery Board  
Stuart Simon, Supporter  
Iain Forbes, Supporter  
Stan Ferguson, Supporter  
Alastair Barge, Supporter  
Iain MacKay, Supporter  
Sara MacLean, Objector  
Jan MacKenzie, Objector  
Danielle de Bisschop, Objector

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were intimated from Councillors Gordon Blair, Mary-Jean Devon, George Freeman, Fred Hall, David Kinniburgh, Iain MacDonald, Alistair MacDougall, Robert G MacIntyre and Richard Trail.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None declared.

**3. THE SCOTTISH SALMON COMPANY: FORMATION OF 16 CAGE FISH FARM AND INSTALLATION OF FEED BARGE: SGIAN DUBH, NORTH OF STRONE POINT, LOCH STRIVEN (REF: 12/02585/MFF)**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

Iain Jackson, Governance and Risk Manager, outlined the hearing procedure that would be followed and noted everyone who wished to speak at the hearing.

The Chair then invited the Planning Officer to set out his

recommendations.

## **PLANNING**

Richard Kerr presented the case on behalf of the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services. He advised that this was a local detailed application by the Scottish Salmon Company for the establishment of a new marine fin fish farm in Loch Striven. It was accompanied by a second application for the expansion of an existing farm already operated by the Company elsewhere in the Loch, which was to be considered separately later today. There was therefore some cumulative impact considerations associated with each of the applications, depending upon the outcome of the other application. He referred to the location of the site which lay on the west side of the lower section of the Loch. He advised that to the north of the site there was a single dwelling accessed by a private track which ran along the coast past the site. In terms of the Local Plan he highlighted the location of the site 3km north of Strone Point and which lay off the sensitive countryside zone which confers undeveloped coastal status on the land adjacent to the site by virtue of the effect of local plan policy CST 2. He referred to slides which showed the location of the site in the context of the whole Loch and he referred to other sites in the Loch. He advised that aquaculture in the upper part of the Loch was confined to shellfish production, the closest mussel site being at Ardbeg 2 km to the north. He advised that the closest dwellings lay approximately 500m to the north and south of the site. He referred to slides showing the extent of the sea bed mooring area, the proposed cages and the feed barge. He also referred to slides showing the site layout with an 18 cell mooring grid containing 16 100m circumference cages, occupying a surface area of about 1.5 hectares and capable of holding a maximum biomass of nearly 2,500 tonnes with a 220 tonne feed barge to be sited at the northern end of the cage group. He also referred to slides giving an impression of the cages contained within the mooring grid. He advised that bird nets would be placed on top of the cages with a hamster wheel supporting the nets. He advised that the nets would be held in tension to deter predators. He advised that underwater lighting would be used to maximise growth in the winter every second year. He advised that the production cycle would be 22 months with a 2 month fallow period prior to restocking. He referred to slides showing the design of the feed barge and advised that the site would be served by boat from the Company's existing shore base at Ardyne. He referred to various photographs showing the location of the site and highlighting the landscape context of the area. He advised that the 2 application sites would be intervisible on the water. He advised that visibility of the site would be confined to a fairly restricted coastal area north of Strone. He advised that there would be no visibility from the Kyles of Bute, a National Scenic Area. He referred to the adjacent landscape character types with visibility mainly within the area which represented the steep ridgeland and mountain Character Type. He circulated to Members a number of photomontages produced by the Applicant to demonstrate the effect of the development on the landscape. He advised that the application had not attracted objections from key consultees such as SEPA, SNH, Marine Science Scotland or the Argyll and District Salmon Fishery Board. He advised that an objection had been lodged by the Clyde Fishermen's Association and

the Colintrave and Glendaruel Community Council. He advised that objections had been received from 12 individuals and that representations in support of the proposal had been received from 35 parties. He advised that a late representation was received from a Colintrave resident commenting that a significant number of the supporters were in fact employees of the Scottish Salmon Company and that accordingly it was questionable whether these should be regarded in the same way that normal expressions of support from the public would be. Mr Kerr advised that from a procedural point of view, it was open to anyone to express a view in respect of a planning application and that it was not incumbent upon representees to declare any interest they may have on a development. However, he advised that this claim arose from a search of the names on the internet along with the company name Scottish Salmon Company, and did appear to indicate that an element of the support expressed did indeed appear to emanate from company employees. He advised that with that in mind, it was a matter for Members to apportion weight to the expressions of support as they saw fit in these circumstances. Mr Kerr advised that one further matter raised by the same representee was that the development proposed did not satisfy the advisory 0.8 km separation distance between fish farms and residential property (the house at Coustonn being 500m away) as recommended in the former Scottish Executive's 1999 guidance note to the Crown Estate. Mr Kerr advised that this guidance was prepared by the government at the time the former Interim Scheme of Fin Farm Development consents operated by the Crown Estate and it preceded the transfer of fish farm consents to planning authorities in 2007. He advised that this guidance was not superseded, although no subsequent guidance to the Crown Estate on to planning authorities has suggested any other guideline separation distance. He advised that he thought it was in part because with greater experience of the operation of aquaculture sites it was considered that locational judgements should be capable of being made on a site by site basis. He advised that updated guidance issued by the Scottish Executive in 2003 deleted reference to separation distances. He advised that neither the more recent Scottish Planning Policy, nor the Council's Development Plan prescribes separation distances, so the issue is one of judgement on a case by case basis. Mr Kerr advised of one further letter of support which had been received from Loch Fyne Oysters.

On a point of order, Iain Jackson advised that Iain MacKay of Loch Fyne Oysters had expressed a wish to speak at the meeting and that as his name or organisation was not listed in the planning report his request had been refused. Mr Jackson advised that as receipt of a representation from Loch Fyne Oysters had been confirmed by Mr Kerr, this would allow Mr MacKay to address the Committee at the appropriate time.

Mr Kerr went onto advise that matters relating to pollution would be addressed by SEPA as part of the CAR licence application so biomass, the administration of medicines and the discharge of faeces and chemicals from the site was not a planning consideration other than for potential impacts on wild fish which were not considered by SEPA as part of their pollution control regime. He advised that in this case the Argyll and District Salmon Fishery Board did not object subject to the site being operated in accordance with industry code of good practice guidelines

and synchronicity with the two existing sites operated by the Applicants. He advised that SNH had not raised any nature conservation considerations of importance and that Marine Science Scotland were of the view that the Loch had the carrying capacity to accept a further site of this scale. He advised that SNH had no objections on landscape or visual grounds. He advised that the site was sufficiently far removed from residential property not to pose an unacceptable threat to amenity. He advised that whilst operations may be audible, given the low ambient noise in this rural area, particularly at time of intensive activity such as harvesting when well boats may be alongside, such occasions would be sporadic and not such as to result in a statutory nuisance. Mr Kerr advised that the Clyde Fishermen's Association had objected on the grounds of reduced inshore fishing ground for boats operating primarily out of Bute. He advised that whilst this would be the case, less than 10% of the overall surface area of the Loch would be given over to aquaculture although a higher percentage of the productive coastal water, perhaps closer to 20%, but both ventures should be able to co-exist without the additional development jeopardising employment in the sea fishing industry.

He advised that the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the report of handling.

## **APPLICANT**

Stewart McLelland advised that he was the Chief Executive of the Scottish Salmon Company and that he was accompanied by his environmental colleague, Mark Edmonds. He advised that he was pleased that the proposal was being recommended for approval and that there was a large number of significant supporters for the proposal on the Council's website. He advised that the Scottish Salmon Company was committed to sustaining the salmon farming business in Argyll and Bute and that they provided training and jobs in the area. He referred to salmon farming in the global market and the importance of farmed salmon to the economy. He referred to the health benefits of salmon and advised that salmon farming was an innovative, highly efficient and sustainable way of producing high quality, affordable food. He referred to salmon farming across Scotland and Argyll and Bute and the economic benefits it brought to the area. He referred to salmon farming being a young industry which was not perfect and referred to it being a solution provider for fragile and rural communities across Scotland. He advised that the product was exported to 60 countries globally. He referred to the profile of the Scottish Salmon Company and highlighted a map showing the areas where the Company operated across Scotland. He advised that they had two processing plants – one at Cairndow and one at Stornoway as well as a range of farms around the area. He referred to the Scottish Salmon Company being economically important to Argyll and Bute, providing direct and indirect employment. He advised that the Scottish Salmon Company were aware of their responsibilities in terms of the environment and that they were legislated by SEPA and Marine Science Scotland. He referred to the Company's involvement with the community of Argyll and Bute. He also referred to the Company's many accreditations advising that they were a fully legislated industry which was

subject to many external audits. He advised that the Scottish Salmon Company was committed to delivering excellence and quality.

Mark Edmonds referred to the key aspects of the application process and explained why this was the right farm in the right location. He advised that following rigorous and extensive research and consultation this site was identified as the most environmentally sustainable location. He advised that through the application process and ongoing dialogue with strategic agencies it had been proven that this development was in an appropriate location. He referred to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment which concluded that the proposed development had no significant environmental impacts. He advised that there were no objections from statutory consultees, that there was strong support from businesses and the community and that Planning Officers recommended approval of this proposal. He advised that the development would create real opportunities for young people and families to stay and work in Argyll.

In conclusion Stewart McLelland advised that fish farming was a highly capital intensive business. He advised that it was not just about creating jobs in the short term, it was to give certainty and confidence to the area in respect of long term future sustainability. He urged Members to support the Planning recommendation and approve the application.

## **CONSULTEES**

### Colintraive and Glendaruel Community Council

Michael Kaufmann advised that he was the Chair of Colintraive and Glendaruel Community Council. He questioned why this application and the application for the extension of the Strone fish farm at Loch Striven were being considered separately. He advised that in terms of cumulative impact he thought they should have been considered together. He referred to, and read out, a comment by the Planning Officer contained within the report of handling in response to an 'objection in relation to the principle of marine salmon farming'. He advised that it was his opinion that this comment was nonsense. He referred to the remote nature of the area and advised that this earned more money for Scotland than fish farming. He referred to the design of the cages and the suggestion that they would sit low on the water. He advised that most of the views of the fish farm would be from elevated positions so would have a significant visual impact. He referred to the area being a fragile community and that no one from here would benefit from this fish farm and that nothing would be accrued to this community. He also referred to the scale and location comments made by Planning.

### Argyll and District Salmon Fishery Board

Craig MacIntyre advised that the Argyll and District Salmon Fishery Board did not object to the proposal. However, he advised that he would like to raise two points. In respect of the need to protect wild fish, he advised that the Board were not objecting to this proposal as there was no wild salmon in the rivers and Loch Striven and that sea trout numbers were very low. He referred to the propagation of sea lice and advised that sea

lice would not be an issue at this farm. He expanded on the Applicant's comments about Loch Fyne fallow and advised that this was introduced after the collapse of salmon and sea trout fisheries in Loch Fyne.

## **SUPPORTERS**

Stuart Simon advised that he works in the fish farming industry and currently works and lives locally to the proposed site. He advised that the employment opportunities that this proposal would create would allow others to settle down in Argyll and Bute. He advised that it was a growing industry and that this was an opportunity to be part of this. He advised that there was a need to look at the bigger picture and its importance to the wider economy and local businesses. He advised that it was important to continue to build on, and invest in, Argyll and Bute. He urged Members to take the bigger picture into consideration and approve this application.

Iain Forbes advised that he spoke on behalf of Fusion Marine, an aquaculture equipment specialist. He advised that they were an Argyll based manufacturer with most of the produce and services sourced locally in the UK. He advised that they employed 14 people with an average annual wage bill of £0.5 million. He advised that the company would not be able to sustain this employment without the support of the Scottish Salmon Company. He expressed his support for the application to form a new fish farm at the site as it could help sustain employment in the area. He advised that Fusion Marine have been able to increase and expand their business through working with the Scottish Salmon Company. He advised that he was impressed with their professionalism and referred to their sensible approach to recycling hardware.

Stan Ferguson spoke on behalf of the Ardmaleish Boatbuilding Company. He advised that they have been able to create jobs on Bute as a result of working with the Scottish Salmon Company and that they were hoping to expand their business further to enable them to work with the well boats. He advised that the proposal was good for the island of Bute and advised that from an environmental point of view it was easier to look at a fish farm than big tankers. He also advised that wild fish were returning to rivers at Glendaruel.

Alastair Barge of Otter Ferry Seafish Limited advised that he has lived and worked locally for 35 years and that in this time he has seen good and bad fish farms. He advised that the industry was growing successfully because the product was good. He advised that as with any new industry there was always a steep learning curve in the beginning and advised that criticism was justified in the past. He advised that planning and SEPA now had full control over development. He advised that there was a tricky balance between the industry and the impact on the environment. He advised that the industry and welfare have moved on greatly. He referred to sea lice being a contentious issue but advised that the decline in wild fish was already happening before fish farms came along. He advised that sea lice were fully under control. He commended the management and stewardship of the Scottish Salmon Company to this meeting.

Iain MacKay spoke on behalf of Loch Fyne Oysters and advised that they relied very heavily on the Scottish Salmon Company for the supply of farmed salmon. He advised that Loch Fyne Oysters employed 80+ staff directly and around 200 people indirectly.

## **OBJECTORS**

Sara MacLean advised that as she lived at Coustonn she was the nearest neighbour to the site. She advised that whilst she was not unsupportive of local employment, she would like to reiterate the Planning Officer's comments in the report of handling in respect of 'objections in relation to employment and economic interests'. She referred to living at an elevated vantage point and that she would have an elevated view of 32 cages instead of 8 if both applications were taken into account. She advised that all the negative impacts were being borne by the Colintrave community. She referred to indicative separation distances and questioned whether a precedent would be set in this respect if this application was approved as she was so close to the site.

Jan MacKenzie referred to the Applicants' comments contained within the report of handling in respect of 'Interaction with community infrastructure'. She advised that all servicing was done from Ardyne and that Colintrave would see no benefits what so ever.

Danielle De Bisschop referred to the Environmental Statement not identifying any major colonies of predators in the vicinity of the application site and advised that there was seal colony nearby. She referred to comments about fish returning to Glendaruel and advised that this has only happened since the removal of a fish farm from that area.

## **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

Councillor Taylor sought and received clarification from Mr Kerr on the planning comment relating to the 'objection in relation to the principle of marine salmon farming' to the effect that matters relating to the location nature and scale of the particular development were relevant considerations, but that objections to the principle of farming fish in the marine environment were not.

Councillor McNaughton referred to the photograph taken of Coustonn point and asked what assessments were carried out on tidal movements at the bay next to the point. Mr Edmonds advised that a site survey was carried out to collect current data which was included in the Environmental Impact Assessment which concluded that the site had capacity for a fish farm.

Councillor McNaughton referred to the separation distances between properties and fish farms and asked if a township or small village had been close to the application site would it have been deemed a suitable site for a fish farm. Mr Kerr advised that it did not matter whether there was one, five or 25 properties, for if separation was required on amenity or other grounds then it was appropriate to ensure that it was provided.

He advised that there were no specific guidelines on separation distances between fish farms and properties and that those judgements were made by Planners on a case by case basis. He advised that it was up to each Councillor to have their own view on what they considered was a reasonable separation distance.

Councillor Colville sought and received clarification from Mr Kerr on why the two planning applications had to be considered separately.

Councillor Colville referred to the following comment within the report of handling – “In accordance with industry good practice it is proposed to monitor feeding response closely in order to minimise unnecessary food waste at this site”, and asked who would be responsible for carrying out this monitoring exercise. Mr Kerr advised that this statement was made by the Applicant.

Councillor Colville sought and received clarification from Ms Dean on how and when this monitoring would be undertaken.

Councillor Colville asked why the west side and not the east side of Loch Striven was chosen for the site. Ms Dean advised that a review was carried out down both sides of the Loch and that from this review 4 or 5 possible locations were considered at the pre application stage. She advised that this site was deemed the least sensitive and most appropriate location.

Councillor Colville sought and received clarification that an employee of the Scottish Salmon Company parked his car at the passing place at Coustonn. Ms Dean advised that parking of this vehicle at this location had not been an issue until the planning application was submitted.

Councillor Taylor asked if there were any other fish farms located within 500 metres of a property. Mr Steward advised that there were 2 that he could immediately think of, a salmon farm located at Furnace and a trout farm on Loch Etive.

Councillor McQueen referred to concerns expressed by objectors that no jobs would be coming to Colintrave and sought comment on these concerns. Dr McLelland advised that he was not familiar with the local demographics of the area but did know that job applications had been received from the local area. He advised that the Scottish Salmon Company’s track record for local employment was excellent and that it was not a case of not wishing to provide benefits to Colintrave.

Councillor Colville sought and received clarification on the marking of buoys and the reasons why it was not necessary to attach a condition to any consent in this case.

## **SUMMING UP**

### Planning

Richard Kerr advised that the salmon fishing industry was considered one



of the country's most significant growth areas by the Scottish Government who were actively supporting the expansion of the sector because of its productive potential, its export value, and its ability to provide employment in rural areas with limited job opportunities – not only in terms of staff employed on farms but also in terms of manufacturers, suppliers and fish processors, who benefited indirectly and supported additional employment. He advised that as part of the drive to increase production the Scottish Salmon Company met with planning and key consultees at an early stage to review a portfolio of prospective new and expanded sites in order to focus on those which appeared to have the better prospects of success from a planning point of view; discounting less preferable sites in the process. He advised that this site at Loch Striven was one of those sites which were progressed to an application stage as a result of that early engagement. He advised that securing consents for fish farms becomes progressively more challenging, given the presence of existing sites, which reduce capacity remaining in terms of pollution control, landscape capacity, wild fish interactions, loss of fishing ground, and all the other material considerations which are impacted upon by cumulative considerations. He advised that this was driving companies to look at more exposed sites which were challenging to operate and potentially more difficult to secure consent for, due to landscape or nature conservation designations. He advised that it was therefore incumbent upon us to consider seriously, remaining opportunities in sea lochs where there was sufficient carrying capacity to absorb further development without compromising the marine environment or adjoining communities and landscape. He advised that planning have concluded that this additional site will not adversely affect the environment to a point which refusal of permission was warranted, and that position was consistent with the views of key consultees such as SEPA, Marine Science Scotland, SNH and the Argyll and District Salmon Fishery Board. He advised that whilst the Clyde Fishermen's Association, the local Community Council and some residents have opposed the proposal, planning do not consider that the grounds advanced by them can be sustained, having regard to the limited adverse environmental consequences of the development, and the economic benefits associated with the proposal. He advised that he recognised the residents' point of view that those closest to the development would not benefit in terms of either employment or indirect benefit, financial or otherwise, but there was no requirement that any development should benefit those closest to a development site, and the fact that employment and economic benefits, local and indirect, might be distributed wider across Argyll did not diminish the importance of those benefits. He commended the application to Members subject to the conditions set out in the report.

### Applicant

Rebecca Dean responded to earlier comments made by the Objectors. She referred to the cumulative impact and confirmed that this had been taken into consideration in respect of both planning applications and that this was one of the reasons why they were both being considered today. She referred to concerns about travelling from Colintraive to work at the fish farms and advised that people living on this side of the Loch were employed at the fish farms. She advised that it was a priority of the

Scottish Salmon Company to create job opportunities for young people. She referred to Ms MacLean's concerns and comments about separation distances and listed a dozen or so instances where fish farms were located close to properties.

Stewart McLelland advised that the Scottish Salmon Company was a good neighbour. He advised that they were committed to the area and operated for the environment, the economy and the local community. He advised that they also wished to invest in the long term future throughout rural Scotland. He advised that it was about getting certainty that they could safeguard what has been built over the years. He advised that they were 100% committed to Argyll and Bute and that they have invested in, and saved many jobs in, Argyll and Bute over the last 3 years. He urged the Councillors to support this planning application.

### Consultees

Michael Kaufmann of Colintrave and Glendaruel Community Council advised that if there were employment opportunities for people living in Colintrave then they would have to travel 1.5 hours to work and if they lived at Coustonn they would have to travel 2 hours. He also referred to the photomontages taken and advised that these were taken with a wide angled lens which diminished the sense of scale and misled the eye and the visual impact of the cages on the Loch.

### Supporters

All the supporters confirmed that they had nothing further to add.

### Objectors

Sara MacLean referred to the photomontages showing the fish farm cages which would increase from 8 to 32.

The Chair asked those present to confirm that they had received a fair hearing and after clarification of the purpose they all confirmed this to be the case.

## **DEBATE**

Councillor MacMillan advised that he has been involved with many fish farm applications over the years and having heard the presentations from everyone today and from reading the paperwork work it was his opinion that this was the best location for the fish farm. He advised that this was a first class planning application which complied with the Argyll and Bute Local Plan. He advised that he would be supporting the recommendation to approve the planning application.

Councillor McNaughton advised that contrary to Councillor MacMillan he had reservations about the visual and cumulative impact of the proposal and that he would be putting forward an amendment to the recommendation.

Councillor Currie advised that this proposal would support the local community and importantly would also support the wider community of Argyll and Bute especially as job opportunities in this area were few and far between. He advised that the proposed location had no environmental impact and that there had been no objections from statutory consultees. He advised that most importantly the proposal complied with Local Plan policy LP AQUA 1. He advised that there was no case to answer and that he would be supporting this planning application.

Councillor Colville advised that he had had concerns regarding the environmental impact but noted that they would be decided on by SEPA. He advised that he had travelled by ferry to the hearing today and that 3 other vehicles on the ferry were travelling to work on fish farms. He advised that he supported this application as it would provide employment to the area.

Councillor Taylor advised that he thought the application should be approved.

### **Motion**

To grant planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report of handling.

Moved by Councillor Sandy Taylor, seconded by Councillor Robin Currie.

### **Amendment**

That the application be refused on the following basis namely:-

The proposal involves the installation of a series of large scale fish cages and an associated service/feed barge located off the west coast of Loch Striven, 3km north of Strone Point just beyond where the public road from Colintrave terminates at Coustonn. The equipment is to be aligned north-south close inshore and parallel to the coastline. Loch Striven is a sea loch extending approximately 12km in length north from the Firth of Clyde. The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the sea loch environment and an adverse visual impact on the locality which is an Area of Panoramic Quality {APQ}. There is an existing fish cage operation nearby and the cumulative impact of granting this application would have a detrimental impact on the environment given the proposed level of fish farm activity within the loch as well as an increased adverse impact on the visual amenity from the related fish farm operations which would in cumulo have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenity of the area. The foregoing shortcomings would conflict with Structure Plan policy STRAT SI 1 and STRAT DC 8 and Local Plan Policies LP ENV 10 and LP AQUA 1 which seek to secure sustainable forms of development which safeguard designated landscape assets of regional importance from uncharacteristic and inappropriate forms of development. The overall scale of the development - due to the number and diameter of cages and the associated barge, the fact that it would be readily visible from close quarter locations on shore and from the loch itself, and that due to its proximity to the existing site at Strone it could be viewed from some

locations in combination with that site, giving rise to inappropriate cumulative impact and a locally unwelcome and disproportionate influence over the coast from multiple aquaculture developments.

Moved by Councillor Alex McNaughton, seconded by Councillor James McQueen.

The Motion was carried by 4 votes to 2 and the Committee resolved accordingly.

## **DECISION**

Agreed to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and reasons:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than wholly in accordance with the following plans and details unless previously approved in writing by the Planning Authority:

- Application Form;
- Admiralty Chart;
- Site Plan;
- Environmental Statement

received by the Planning Authority on 11.12.12 .

*Reason: For the purpose of clarity, to ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved details.*

2. In the event that the development or any associated equipment approved by this permission ceases to be in operational use for a period exceeding three years, the equipment shall be wholly removed from the site thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure that redundant development does not sterilise capacity for future development within the same water body.*

3. In the event of equipment falling into disrepair or becoming damaged, adrift, stranded, abandoned or sunk in such a manner as to cause an obstruction or danger to navigation, the developer shall carry out or make suitable arrangements for the carrying out of all measures necessary for lighting, buoing, raising, repairing, moving or destroying, as appropriate, the whole or any part of the equipment.

*Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.*

4. All lighting above the water surface and not required for safe navigation purposes should be directed downwards by shielding and be extinguished when not required for the purpose for which it is installed

on the site.

*Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.*

5. The finished surfaces of all equipment above the water surface including the feed barge and surface floats and buoys associated with the development hereby permitted (excluding those required to comply with navigational requirements) shall be non-reflective and finished in a dark recessive colour in accordance with colour schemes to be agreed in advance of development commencing in writing by the Planning Authority (by way of BS numbers or manufacturer's specifications) unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.*

6. The farm shall be operated in synchronous production and management with neighbouring salmon farms within Marine Scotland Management Area 9b at Strone and Ardyne.

*Reason: In order to ensure management of the site in a manner which minimises the risks to wild salmonids, in the interests of nature conservation.*

(Reference: Report by Head of Planning and Regulatory Services dated 22 March 2013, submitted)