

**MINUTES of MEETING of PLANNING, PROTECTIVE SERVICES AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**  
**held in the VILLAGE HALL, CULLIPOOL, ISLE OF LUING**  
**on MONDAY, 31 JANUARY 2011**

**Present:**

Councillor Daniel Kelly (Chair)

Councillor David Kinniburgh  
Councillor Alister MacAlister  
Councillor Neil Mackay

Councillor Roderick McCuish  
Councillor Alex McNaughton  
Councillor Al Reay

**Attending:**

Charles Reppke, Head of Governance and Law  
Richard Kerr, Senior Planning Officer  
Fiona Scott, Planning Officer  
Daniel Addis, Enforcement Officer  
Paul Reynolds, Environmental Health Officer  
Eddie Shaw, Health and Safety Officer  
Donald Anderson, ATK Partnership  
Shauna Cameron, Architect for Applicant  
John Peden, Applicant  
Jane MacLaughlan, Supporter  
Peter Hooper, Supporter  
Mairi Ritchie, Supporter  
Alison Robertson, Supporter  
David Ritchie, Supporter  
Phillip Robertson, Supporter  
Norman Bissell, Supporter  
Fiona Rodgers, Objector  
Paul Houghton, Objector  
Barry Wilson, Objector  
Peter Cook, Objector  
Joe Hughes, Objector  
Edna Whyte, Objector  
Peter Lamont, Objector

**Apologies:**

Councillor Rory Colville  
Councillor Robin Currie  
Councillor Vivien Dance  
Councillor Mary-Jean Devon

Councillor Bruce Marshall  
Councillor Donald MacMillan  
Councillor James McQueen

Charles Reppke apologised for the administrative errors that had been made in the report by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services dated November 2010 with regard to planning application 10/01059/PP. Parties who had submitted letters of support had been wrongly listed in the report as objectors. Mr Reppke advised that a supplementary report had been issued to all interested parties prior to the meeting correcting these errors.

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

The Committee introduced themselves to those present and Charles Reppke outlined the procedure that would be followed during the hearing. He advised that there were 2 applications on the agenda to be considered by the Committee, that they would be heard together but determined separately. He asked that all persons wishing to address the Committee identify themselves.

## **Planning Authority**

Fiona Scott, Planning Officer, advised that there were 2 applications before the Committee for consideration. She advised that both applications had been presented to the PPSL Committee on 15 December 2010 and continued to a hearing due to the number of representations received and as a result of conflicting information within the structural reports provided by the applicants and the objectors. The Council had appointed an independent structural engineer, ATK Partnership, to assess both reports and provide a definitive response with regard to the structural integrity of the ruin of the engine shed. Due to the conclusion by ATK Partnership that the ruin did have the potential to be incorporated into a redevelopment scheme as a non-load bearing element Fiona advised that in light of this new information planning were now recommending refusal of conservation area consent for the demolition of the engine shed. She further advised that as the second application for the erection of the centre relied on the demolition of the shed, planning were recommending that this application also be refused as it would require to be withdrawn and a revised proposal incorporating the ruin submitted.

## **Applicant**

Shauna Cameron, architect for the applicants, introduced herself. She gave an overview of both applications and showed photographs within a presentation of the engine shed and quarry from both present and past. Shauna advised that the retention of the walls of the engine shed had been considered in the original design of the centre in 2007 but the design had since been changed to reuse the slate during construction of the centre. She added that the ruin had little impact on the overall appearance of the conservation area and as the ruin was not listed, not scheduled or had no planning conditions placed on it with regard to maintaining or stabilising the walls it was clear that it would only be left to deteriorate. Shauna made reference to the 3 engineers reports that had been produced. She advised that the structural report John Peden had carried out did not say that the walls could not be incorporated into the new design but had recommended demolition as the best option. She highlighted that the 3<sup>rd</sup> report by ATK had been produced using the previous 2 reports without visiting the site. ATK had concluded by recommending removal of 70% of the engine shed walls and Shauna questioned if keeping 30% of the existing wall could be considered retention of the engine shed. She added that structural engineers reports had suggested removing at least 70% of the existing walls. Shauna gave an overview of the costs that would be incurred by retaining the existing walls in the design, added that the maintenance costs would also be higher and would place a financial burden on the Community. Shauna advised that the engine shed had been the inspiration for the design of the new centre and showed the Committee pictures of the proposed design. She advised that it was a low maintenance design which would be sustainable by the small community. Shauna concluded by saying that if demolition was not approved then the project would be unlikely to go ahead as they would be likely to lose the European funding they had been awarded for the project. She asked that the Committee approve the development of the Atlantic Islands Centre as it was a valuable

gift from the present community to the children of Luing.

## **Consultees**

Peter Lamont read out a statement on behalf of Audrey Gardner of the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland. The statement advised that the AHSS were committed to preservation of architecture, that the engine shed should only be demolished if no other option was available, that the proposed development did not enhance or contribute to the conservation area and that it would have a detrimental impact on the site. The statement advised that the use of glazing in the design distanced new from the old character of the engine shed. It concluded by saying that it was hoped that if the demolition of the engine shed was approved it was hoped that something new and good would come from it.

Paul Reynolds, Environmental Health Officer advised that concerns over noise and food smells had been addressed by appropriate planning conditions and that he had no further comment.

Eddie Shaw, Health and Safety Officer advised that the means of control that would be put in place after construction of the centre would enhance safety with regards to the flooded quarry and added that a further risk assessment would be undertaken should the application be approved.

## **Supporters**

Jane MacLachlan introduced herself as Vice Convener of Luing History Group Committee. She told the Committee that there was a desperate need for a museum on Luing as currently artefacts were being held in peoples homes with summer exhibitions organised in the village halls. She advised that the new centre would provide a study centre, reference point and a chance for the community to integrate without prior organisation. She added that she supported the demolition of the precarious structure that was the engine shed and highlighted that it was not a listed building. She concluded by saying that the centre would allow Luing's heritage to be made available and to be added to in the future.

Peter Hooper introduced himself as a Member of Luing Community Trust. Mr Hooper began by telling the Committee that any objections that had been made were with a view to stopping the project rather than conserving the walls of the engine shed. He advised that planning of the centre had begun in 2003 and at that point there had been no reference made to conservation of the walls. Mr Hooper advised that the Trust had looked at another two sites as well as the engine shed site and that this site was the most suitable. He advised that the project had secured £457,000 of European Funding which was available to claim until April 2011 and any delay of the project, such as resubmitting planning applications, would jeopardise this funding. Mr Hooper told the Committee that the implications made by objectors that the jobs created in the new centre would not be worthwhile were not true and that just one job created would be an advantage to the island. He concluded by saying that it was a community project that was supported by the majority of residents and that the centre would be both an asset and a gift to the community.

Mhairi Ritchie introduced herself as Chair of the Parent Council. She advised that all the parents she had spoken to were in favour of the project. She spoke of the recent threat of school closure and how the community had come together to resist the

proposal. She advised that the school encourages young families to stay on the island. Ms Ritchie advised that currently the children had little opportunity to develop their skills and that the centre would promote the children's work. The children had expressed the opinion that they too were in favour of the centre. Ms Ritchie compared the proposal to the centre that had been built on Lismore and told the Committee that the centre would encourage a deeper relationship with the island. She concluded by saying that today's children were the future of the Island.

Alison Robertson introduced herself and told the Committee that she was speaking for the people who were at work and school and could not attend the hearing. She told the Committee that most of the residents on the island were of retirement age and that there was a need for young families. She advised that there were currently 2 village halls on the island, who worked together to hold regular events, along with the school. She advised that currently there were no café/restaurant facilities on the island that people could use spontaneously and that any social events had to be organised by one of the halls. Ms Robertson advised the Committee that the Centre would boost economy on the island, boost tourism and would not work in competition with the halls and school but together with them. The Centre would be used all year, by tourists in the summer and as a place for residents to socialise in the winter; somewhere to have a meal without worrying about being back in time for a ferry crossing. Ms Robertson told Members that Easdale Island and other slate islands had featured on the television programme Coast recently and that Luig had not been mentioned; the island had felt excluded and this was a good reason for the introduction of something such as the Centre, it would bring interest to the island.

David Ritchie introduced himself, he told the Committee that he had been employed on the island for 10 years. Mr Ritchie advised that his son had lived on the island of Coll and that it was very similar to the Island of Luig apart from that Luig did not have hotel/café facilities. He advised that the hotel on Coll was very successful and that it brought employment benefits to the island all year round. He referred to comments made by objectors regarding the limited ferry service and advised that the ferry spent most of its time tied to the slip and that an increase in traffic to the island would secure the ferry service. Mr Ritchie advised that no one knew if the centre would be successful but if it was not approved then no one would ever know. He gave an example of a successful family business on Cullipool Pier. Mr Ritchie concluded by asking the Committee why they should knock back the opportunity for a centre for the sake of a ruin? He advised that the trust were trying to breathe life back into the island by introducing a new business.

Phillip Robertson introduced himself as a resident of Cullipool who had attended the primary school when he was younger and highlighted that he knew Cullipool very well. He stated that, in his opinion, the engine shed was a useless building. Mr Robertson told the Committee that he was in favour of the development, that he did not want a dead island. He gave examples of how busy the island was in the 1940s, 50s and 60s. He concluded by saying that he was proud to be local.

Normal Bissell began by telling the Committee that listening to the previous speakers had made him emotional. Mr Bissell told the Committee that he had lived on the island for 12 years and regularly joined in with community events. He referred to the report that had been before the Committee on 15 December and highlighted that planning had rejected every one of the objections that had been made. Mr Bissell continued by saying that there was no good reason why the recommendation should be changed to refuse the demolition of the engine shed, that ATK did not visit the site and that it could

be seen as grounds for appeal. He told the Committee that the overall design would be restricted should it be contained within the existing structure, that it would be too small and would have few windows. The existing structure would serve no purpose as it would not be part of the new structure and the hipped roof would not be attached. He highlighted that the proposal was in accordance with the local plan and that demolition could be supported as a minor departure. Mr Bissell advised that submitting revised plans would delay the project, jeopardise the European funding that had been awarded and the project would come to an end. Mr Bissell told the Committee that he had visited other Trusts to explain the project and to learn of their experiences in similar projects. They had all supported the project and had received the same kind of objections for their own projects. He explained that the grant was an opportunity for the island to move forward and that most residents supported the project. He explained that 24 of the objections had been from holiday home owners that wanted to preserve the peace and tranquillity of the island. Mr Bissell advised that the population of the island had been declining in recent years, that the centre was an opportunity to provide employment and to encourage new families to move to the island. He concluded by saying that he was asking for approval of both applications and that in his opinion the island would decline further if the centre was not approved.

## **Objectors**

Fiona Rodgers introduced herself and advised that she was speaking on behalf of a group of objectors who were asking the Committee for refusal of both applications. Ms Rodgers disputed the figures that had been quoted with regard to membership of the trust and advised that the majority of residents of the island were not members. Ms Rodgers advised that a meeting had been held in March before submission of the application for planning permission and at this point there had been no mention to the community of the demolition of the engine shed. She advised that the Community Council had declared an interest in the project and had refused to comment on the project or hold a meeting to discuss it. She made reference to the failure of the Trust to consult residents on the project and the fact that no one had seen the business plan for the project. They had been told that work on the plan had been put on hold until after the hearing and she advised that it was not possible to measure the viability of a project without a business plan. Ms Rodgers advised that the limited ferry service was a concern, maintenance costs of the new building were a concern, that there were concerns over the viability of the project and concerns over the impact on the community. She advised that she could not see how a decision could be made without knowing what the impact of such a project would be. Ms Rodgers continued by saying that there was no need for the centre, that the island already had 2 village halls and use of the school. She advised that the centre could have a detrimental effect on the existing halls and also on the shop which sold teas, coffees and crafts. She highlighted that any impact on the shop could be fatal and with no shop there would be no post office. Ms Rodgers told the Committee that there had been proposals to expand the use of the school as a café and exhibitions and that this lessened the need for a centre even more. Ms Rodgers advised that the engine shed had not been marketed publicly as required by planning policy. She concluded by telling the Committee that on behalf of the objectors she urged for refusal of both applications, that there was no need for the centre and that it would be harmful to the community. She advised that they were for preservation but not overdevelopment and that they wanted café facilities on the island but with use of the existing facilities. She highlighted that Luing was not the dying community it had been portrayed as, that the islanders were very actively involved.

Mr Paul Houghton introduced himself and advised that he had been asked to make reference to heritage issues and to provide a framework for the objections that had been made. Mr Houghton referred to planning policies and Historic Scotland Guidance and made reference to the fact that the engine shed had not been publicly marketed and had not been subject of a beyond economic repair test. He commented on the lack of documentation that had been made available by the trust. He Highlighted that there had been no business plan produced, no information on construction costs had been available until that day, no information on the alternative sites that had been considered had been made available until that day and no information on the public benefits that the centre would bring had been produced. Mr Houghton told the Committee that the possibility of retaining the building was supported by Historic Scotland and that the setting of the site and listed buildings in the surrounding conservation area should have been considered when the centre was designed. He advised that the proposal was out of scale, that the roof was higher than surrounding buildings and that the extension was too large. He advised that the design should have been made more sympathetic to the surrounding area. Mr Houghton concluded by telling the Committee that he urged for refusal of the applications. He again highlighted the lack of documentation that had been produced, that the design was unsympathetic to the village and if Members were minded to support, the proposal would be a significant departure to planning policy.

The meeting adjourned for lunch between 1.10pm and 1.40pm.

Barry Wilson introduced himself as the founder of the Community Trust. He advised that he had been involved with the project from the beginning and that he wanted to see the engine shed alone developed. He advised that the membership of the Trust had dwindled during the project development. He made reference to the reduced ferry service and how the increased traffic would affect this. Mr Wilson advised that in his opinion, 5 public buildings were too many for an island and that there was not enough money to maintain them. He advised that the revenue taken in by the centre would not cover the maintenance costs and made reference to Easdale Island museum and the fact that it had only taken 3,000 visitors the previous year. He advised that Easdale Island had recently had a new hall built and were struggling to maintain it. Finally Mr Wilson told the Committee that the centre was the wrong design and on the wrong site and that he would like to see something developed elsewhere on the island and with a different design.

Peter Cook advised that he had lived in Cullipool House for 3 and a half years. He highlighted that there had been some very emotional speakers and that he had been touched by some of the supporters speeches. Mr Cook advised that he could not support a project that did not have a business plan. He advised that he could not support the building in its present form, that it was too big for the site, that he would like to see the size of the building reduced or the site changed.

Edna White introduced herself. She advised that the proposals went against the culture of the island. She advised that 30 years previously Luving had been a depressed mining village, that there were 14 families on the island and now there were 24; that the prosperity and affluence on the island had grown and there was now a much better spread of ages. Ms White advised that the problem with the application was that it was on a restricted site, that there was no room for expansion. Finally she told the Committee that she resented the comments made by supporters around second home owners as many of them did come to live on the island when they reached retirement age.

## Questions

Councillor McCuish asked the Trust why they had chosen the engine shed site. He was told that the funding the Trust had been awarded was restricted to the engine shed site, if the site was moved they would lose the funding.

Councillor MacKay asked the applicants what the similarities were between the proposal and the Centre on Lismore. Shauna Cameron replied that it was very similar to Lismore Centre with regard to scale apart from an extra 50m<sup>2</sup> that would be used by the History Group. Councillor MacKay asked Planning why the 3<sup>rd</sup> engineer had not visited the site. Richard Kerr told him it was because he had been employed to assess the first two structural reports and not the site. Councillor MacKay asked if the recommendation for refusal of demolition was due to the findings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> report to which Mr Kerr replied yes. Councillor MacKay asked Mr Houghton to explain the assertion he had made that the Council had an interest in the site. Mr Houghton told him that he had heard that the Council had contributed to the costs of applying for planning permission. Mr Kerr advised that this was not correct.

Councillor Kelly asked where the money had come from to pay for the application costs. Mr Bissell replied that they had received £12,000 of Argyll and the Islands Leader funding and £10,000 of Big Lottery funding and advised that the Big Lottery Funding had been used to fund the application.

Councillor Reay asked Mr Bissell if there were sufficient remains to reflect the original site and if funding would be required to maintain it to which he replied that there were not and that funding would be required.

Councillor McCuish asked the objectors what the benefits to the community would be if the project did not go ahead. Ms Rodgers replied that it would be the majority of the community's wish and that the utilisation of the village halls and school would be encouraged.

Councillor McCuish asked the objectors how many visits had been made by visitors to the engine shed to which Ms Rodgers replied that they did not know.

Councillor Kinniburgh asked with reference to the survey that had been carried out on centre use, how many people had been surveyed and at what time this had taken place. Mr Hooper advised that 55 residents and 107 visitors had been surveyed at the ferry in the summer of 2009 over a period of 5 weeks when volunteers had the time.

Councillor Reay asked Mr Cook if he would support the proposed building if it was on a different site to which he replied that he would and that he would also support the use of the engine shed with a smaller extension.

Councillor McCuish asked Mr Houghton about the reference he'd made to listed buildings when the engine shed was not a listed building. Mr Houghton told him that he had made reference to non listed buildings within conservation areas.

Councillor Reay asked the applicants when applying for funding if the retention of the engine shed part of the required criteria. Mr Bissell confirmed that the funders were happy with the design of the centre and that there was no requirement to retain the engine shed as part of the new design. He added that they had provided information

on the nature and history of the site to the funders.

Councillor McCuish asked planning if the applications were not approved and nothing was developed on the site what would happen to the engine shed. Mr Kerr advised him that it would continue to deteriorate as it was not a listed building. He advised that the only policy protecting it was that of against demolition.

Councillor MacKay commented that in terms of policy ENV15; in order to approve demolition, planners must have plans for re-use of the site and asked planners if the outcome of the 3<sup>rd</sup> structural report was their only reason for refusal to which Mr Kerr replied it was.

## **Sum Up**

### **Planning**

Richard Kerr expressed to Members the importance of confining their decision to that of land use and not the non material considerations that had been conveyed during the meeting by interested parties. Mr Kerr again explained the reasons for the change in recommendation and highlighted that redevelopment was dependant on conservation area consent being granted for the demolition of the engine shed.

### **Applicant**

Ms Cameron asked that members consider the fact that if the shed was to be retained, 70% of the existing structure would be demolished which in her opinion was not retention. With regard to the new build she advised that full design statements had been submitted, parking issues had been addressed and that a full Business Plan was available. She advised that the design had been produced over a number of years, with careful consideration and that the demolition of the engine shed would not have been considered if it was not worth it.

### **Consultees**

Mr Lamont advised that he had no further comment on behalf of AHSS.

### **Supporters**

Ms MacLachlan advised that she had no further comment other than that she was desperate for the project to go ahead.

Mr Hooper in response made to the assertions that the site had not been placed on the open market told the Committee that he had a letter regarding the sale of the shed that clearly stated that the shed had been on the open market. He advised that consultation on the project always took place by means of open meetings and that the only private meeting the Trust had held was in March to finalise the decision on submission of final planning permission.

Ms Ritchie added that as Chair of the Hall Committee she had been approached by the Trust to discuss the impact of the Centre on the Hall and it had been agreed that the hall with community support would work around it.

Ms Robertson advised that the culture of the island was to work together as a



community and that the proposal was not for a third hall but for something different for the island.

Mr Ritchie told the Committee that he did not know how the project would evolve but the only way to find out was to go ahead with it.

Mr Robertson advised the Committee of a time that 6 houses were demolished on the island without objection due to the attitude live and let live and told the Committee there were too many people that complain about things.

Mr Bissell advised the Trust membership had actually increased recently and that 92% of members had voted for the project to go ahead. He added that out of 77 Trust members 69 had voted; with 63 voting for the project, 3 against the project and 3 abstaining from voting. With regard to the business plan he advised that the trust had obtained professional advice and support in producing this and the figures showed the project to be both viable and sustainable. In connection with alternative sites he noted that no written offer to sell had been received for one of the sites. Mr Bissell told the Committee the site could not be resold due to a deed of restriction and that if the proposal was not approved then the site would be left to deteriorate and that the funding would fall if not utilised.

## **Objectors**

Mr Houghton advised that the impact of businesses was in fact a material consideration when determining an application. He again made reference to the lack of a Business Plan and asserted that a decision could not be made without it. He made reference to a CRGP report, advised that this was also important and that a decision should not be made without it, that it should have been encompassed in the report.

Ms Rodgers advised that she disputed the consultation process carried out by the Trust. She advised that the 66 votes for the project made by Trust Members was not representative of the island. She added that there may be a viable project for the island but not the current one and not on the proposed site.

Mr Wilson told the Committee of the public meetings that had taken place. He advised that the first had taken place in February 2009, 52 people had attended and only one objected because it had been made clear what was going to happen. At the second meeting postal votes had been brought in already opened, he claimed that 4 of the votes against the project had gone missing and highlighted that they should not have been opened in private before the meeting. He advised that the original plans for redevelopment had incorporated the shed but this had not proved viable and so a bigger design had been produced.

Mr Cook stated that it was a shame that the Community had been divided by the application. He questioned whether the possible loss of funding was part of the consideration by the Committee.

Ms White told the Committee she objected to the presentation of a large building on a small site and questioned what the funders would think if they were brought to the island to see what they had approved. She advised that people had assumed that the engine shed would be incorporated into the new design and did not realise that it would involve demolition.

Councillor Kelly asked all those present if they considered that they had had a fair hearing to which they agreed they had.

## **Determination**

Councillor MacKay noted that there had obviously been extensive pre-application discussions and that the design had been produced in accordance with policy. He advised that he had taken into account that all three structural reports had recommended demolition of 70% of the existing walls. Councillor MacKay advised that he had been impressed with the community spirit over the school closure and that it was important that the community was not divided over the application. He advised that when looking at the benefits the centre had brought to Lismore it was apparent that the Centre would be an asset to the community and for that reason he advised that he would approve the demolition of the engine shed.

Councillor McCuish advised that he had been saddened at the split in the community that the application had caused. He stressed the importance of the island moving forward and advised that he would go against the recommendation by planning and approve the demolition of the engine shed.

Councillor McNaughton advised that he was from a rural community and was sad to see the split in the community. He advised that although it was hard for a community to move forward it was important that they did to prevent stagnation. Having seen the condition of the shed he advised that he would approve demolition of the shed.

Councillor Reay advised he was from Helensburgh which had little community spirit. He advised that although it was important for a site to reflect its history, there was nothing on the site that was viable and that he too supported the demolition of the shed.

Councillor Kinniburgh advised that this was a very difficult decision to make but having visited the site and looking at the shed he would not revisit the island to look at the shed. He advised that if there was a heritage centre on the island he probably would come back to visit it and therefore he supported the demolition of the engine shed.

Councillor Reay added that during the hearing both sides had given very passionate cases and that he wished the two sides had come forward and compromised on the proposal.

Councillor MacAlister advised that he believed a different site would not reflect the memento of the slate quarry. He advised that after looking at the site, once the soft mortar had been removed from the remains of the shed there would be nothing left and therefore he advised he supported demolition of the shed.

The chair noted the various opinions from members and indicated that he would now deal with each of the applications in turn .

## **2. ISLE OF LUING COMMUNITY TRUST: DEMOLITION OF UNLISTED BUILDING IN CONSERVATION AREA: LAND SOUTHEAST OF CULLIPOOL HOUSE, CULLIPOOL, ISLE OF LUING (REF: 10/01348/CONAC)**

## **Decision**

The desk top interpretation of the two reports by John Peden Associates and David Narro Associates, does not indicate any new factors that would have sufficient weight to overturn the previous recommendation to approve this application by the Planning Department. The proposal accords with policies STRAT DC1 and STRAT DC9 of the approved Argyll and Bute Structure Plan 2002. Likewise it accords with policies LP COM 1, LP ENV 1, LP ENV 13 B2 and LP ENV 15 of the Argyll and Bute Adopted Local Plan 2009. It can be justified as a 'Minor Departure' from Policy LP ENV 13 B1 as the demolition of the structure will allow the site to be developed with a larger social and heritage scheme, subject of Planning Application 10/1059/PP which will benefit the local community and visitors to the island. It will also be subject to appropriate conditions agreed by the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee and the Head of Planning and subsequently referred to Historic Scotland for final clearance. All three structural reports indicate the need for substantial rebuilding in the event that any attempt is made to retain the structure or to incorporate it within a new building, as a result of which, the historical integrity of the building would be compromised to a significant extent.

(Reference: Reports by Head of Planning and Regulatory Services dated November 2010 and January 2011)

### **3. ISLE OF LUING COMMUNITY TRUST: ERECTION OF BUILDING INCORPORATING MUSEUM, LICENSED CAFE, EXHIBITION/FUNCTION ROOM AND OFFICE: LAND EAST OF CULLIPOOL HOUSE, CULLIPOOL, ISLE OF LUING (REF: 10/01059/PP)**

## **Decision**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services dated November 2010.

(Reference: Reports by Head of Planning and Regulatory Services dated November 2010 and January 2011)