

Item: 4

Planning Committee: 25 June 2025.

Proposed Alteration and Extension of Office Building, Change of Use to Mixed Use Facility, Extension of Car Parking, and Associated Infrastructure and Landscaping at the Orkney Research and Innovation Campus, Stromness.

Report by Director of Infrastructure and Organisational Development.

1. Overview

- 1.1. This report considers an application for alteration and extension of the Orkney Research and Innovation Campus (ORIC) at the former Stromness Academy, Back Road, Stromness. The works include the alteration and extension of the existing Block 3; the proposed extension is three storeys with a roof terrace. A change of use is proposed to the building as extended, to create a mixed-use food and drink (Class 3), office (Class 4) and education (Class 10) facility, to be used in conjunction with the wider campus. The works also comprise the installation of six air source heat pumps to serve the extended building, and the installation of external wall insulation and air source heat pumps to the Charles Clouston Building. To the south of the site, proposed works include the reconfiguration and significant extension of existing car parking. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure would be installed, alongside associated hard and soft landscaping, including construction of a ramp and steps at the north-east corner of the campus.
- 1.2. A total of 32 valid representations have been submitted. Of those, 29 submitted are in objection, one is in support, and two are neutral.
- 1.3. The development would have an impact on the setting of Stromness given the prominence of the site. This includes the setting of Stromness Conservation Area, and in the context that the site is located within the Hoy and West Mainland National Scenic Area. The functional benefits to the educational campus are balanced against those townscape impacts, and impacts on adjacent properties. Also relevant is the detailed design, of external finishes in combination with the scale and form of the building. On balance, it is considered that the development complies with relevant policies, and that objections and other material considerations do not merit refusal of the application.

Application Reference:	23/458/PP.
Application Type:	Planning Permission.
Proposal:	Alter and extend office building (Block 3) including three storey extension with roof terrace, and change of use, to create a mixed-use food and drink (Class 3), office (Class 4) and education (Class 10) facility, install six air source heat pumps, install external wall insulation and air source heat pumps (Charles Clouston Building), reconfigure and construct car parking, install electric vehicle charging infrastructure, associated hard and soft landscaping including construction of a ramp and steps, and install air source heat pumps (Robert Rendall Building).
Applicant:	Mr Harvey Stevenson, Highlands and Islands Enterprise.
Agent:	HRI Munro Architecture, 62 Academy Street, Inverness, IV1 1LP.

- 1.4. All application documents (including plans, consultation responses and valid representations) are available for members to view [here](#) (click on “Accept and Search” to confirm the Disclaimer and Copyright document has been read and understood, and then enter the application number given above).

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. It is recommended that members of the Committee:
- i. Approve the application for planning permission in respect of the proposed alteration and extension of an office building, change of use to a mixed-use facility, extension of car parking, and associated infrastructure and landscaping at the Orkney Research and Innovation Campus, Back Road, Stromness, subject to the conditions detailed in Appendix 1 to this report.

3. Consultations

Engineering Services (April 2025)

- 3.1. “The proposed development is not indicated on SEPA flood hazard mapping to be at risk of flooding from any source. However, the development would have potential to increase flooding downstream if site discharge rates were to increase. The standard of surface water flood protection considered appropriate by OIC Engineering to central Stromness, due to the high number of receptors along the western side of Hamnavoe and potential impact of exceedance, is for a 1 in 200

return period event with 40% climate change uplift applied. It should be demonstrated that post-development surface water discharges from previously developed areas of the site will be equal to or lower than current discharge rates and that the discharge rate from the previously undeveloped portion of the site (the car parking at the southern end) should not exceed the greenfield runoff rate during worst case events with return periods of 1 year to 200 years.

The following information is required to assess flood risk associated with the proposed development:

- 1) A description of the proposed drainage system, including surface water, SuDS and alterations to the existing drainage is required. This should include an explanation of the strategy to divert surface water from the northern end to the southern end of the development.
- 2) Maintenance responsibilities and schedules of the maintenance that will be carried out by the appropriate responsible organisation(s) for all surface water drainage elements including SuDS devices.
- 3) A plan showing the catchment served by the proposed surface water system including areas is required with contributing areas displayed in m².
- 4) Confirmation that Scottish Water permission to connect at the locations and rates proposed has been obtained.”

Engineering Services (May 2025)

- 3.2. “The overall drainage strategy has been amended to remove the link between the north and south ends of the existing car park. This is welcomed. The Drainage Statement provided (Revision 1, 6th March 2025) demonstrates that the current proposal would represent a betterment of surface water site discharge compared to the existing arrangement. However, the presented discharge from the proposed new car parking at the southern end of the site exceeds the runoff rate we would expect from a green field of that area. With an impermeable area of 1088m², the discharge proposed would be approximately 32l/s/ha compared to a calculated greenfield runoff rate of approximately 9l/s/ha for a 1 in 2 year event. As stated in the earlier OIC Engineering flood risk consultation response, ‘the discharge rate from the previously undeveloped portion of the site (the car parking at the southern end) should not exceed the greenfield runoff rate’. It is acknowledged that topography and ground conditions make this a challenging development site, however in the interest of flood resilience we request that the standard

requirement for discharges from previously undeveloped land not to exceed calculated greenfield runoff rates be met.”

Engineering Services (May 2025)

- 3.3. “The revised Drainage Statement, Revision 2 - dated 6th May 2025 and Drawing 1017 Rev. E, dated May 2025, are satisfactory. We do not object to the application.”

Roads Services (January 2025)

- 3.4. “The revised parking provision for this development is welcomed and whilst still falling short of that required by the NRDG, when considered with the proposal for the Travel Plan indicated in the Design Statement Addendum date 12 December 2024, the parking element of the development is nearing acceptability with just a couple of matters requiring further information and or amendment.
- The information provided indicates that in addition to accessible EV charging bays there will be 10 disabled parking spaces provided, which is more than that required by the NRDG and DOT guidance. Therefore, the reasoning for providing more disabled bays than required should be provided or the provision amended.
 - The proposed echelon parking near the hyperbaric chamber isn’t ideal as it would require vehicles which entered the spaces in a forward direction, to have to reverse out of the spaces and back down towards main areas of the car park. Or alternatively turn within the car park and reverse back into the spaces. Given that the echelon parking is between the gable side of the Charles Clouston Building and the access to the hyperbaric chamber, there is a potential that the access could be narrowed if larger vehicles use the spaces or by drivers trying to keep their vehicles from touching the building whilst parking.

The inclusion of SuDS information with the latest submission is also welcomed, however the level of detail provided is less than is needed to enable the surface water drainage proposals to be assessed for suitability. The information required to enable the SuDS proposals to be assessed is something that will be expanded upon in the consultation response from Engineering Services. The points noted below should be addressed and may also be raised by Engineering Services in their consultation response.

- The SuDS system as shown on the information provided show a single solution for surface water drainage which is not acceptable. Instead, there should be

separate systems for each element of the development, one of car park extension and one for building development.

- It would be preferable not to use permeable paving for the parking bay construction in the new area of the car park.
- The use of cellular storage for the attenuation of surface water drainage should be avoided due to long term maintenance difficulties.
- If surface water drainage from the development is to be discharged into the Scottish Water drainage network, evidence that Scottish Water will permit the discharge into their systems will be required.

The lighting report provided with the latest information includes details of outdoor lighting for the entire development area, when what would normally be expected would be separate reports for adoptable and unadopted areas with each with their own power supply. The lighting levels indicated in the lighting report also look to be rather high for a low traffic car park.

Drawing No T-7294-003 Rev No 4 Proposed Site / Block Plan and the Design statement, Section 4.6, paragraph 4, point 3, indicate ‘new landscaped share surface’ or ‘re-surfacing of the roadway’, however no detail for either area has been provided. The construction details for the ‘Proposed Paved Courtyard + Shared Surface’ area indicated must be supplied for further comment.

Therefore, Roads Services object to this development proposal until such times as further information is submitted to address all the matters noted above.”

Roads Services (May 2025)

- 3.5. “The revised layout of the new section of car park is acceptable, however the proposed layout of the parking bays for the existing and new section of car park will need some amendments for safety and manoeuvrability within the car park. Consideration also needs to be given to the inclusion of the proposed pedestrian walkway along the southern side of the car park as this could give rise to a degree of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, it also narrows the effective aisle width within the lower section of the car park to 4.8 metres which is unacceptable. Possibly a more pragmatic solution would be to maintain and improve the exiting pedestrian routes within the car park. The revised lighting proposals for the car park are unacceptable and must be revised using a more traditional lighting scheme of streetlighting columns as opposed to the bollards currently proposed.”

Scottish Water

- 3.6. “Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application”

Orkney Heritage Society

- 3.7. “OHS has no further comment to make on this application.”

NatureScot

- 3.8. “Hoy and West Mainland National Scenic Area (NSA)

Having reviewed the supporting information for the proposed development, we do not consider that it would raise issues of National Interest in relation to its landscape, visual or cumulative effects. This is not to say that the development would not result in significant landscape or visual effects, rather that NatureScot does not judge these effects to meet our threshold in respect of our national remit for landscapes.

Advice

Hoy and West Mainland NSA

On review of the Special Landscape Qualities (SLQ) of the NSA, SLQ The townscape of Stromness, its setting and its link with the sea is well expressed. We consider there to be sufficient design considerations proposed to reduce the prominence of the development and integrate it with the surrounding townscape, namely the consideration of scale, use of timber clad 'fins' to reduce reflectivity of the facade and the re-use of stone material. In Stromness, buildings with light/white exteriors tend to be located around the harbour; the design statement addendum states that colour and textures are to be coordinated between HRI Munro and OIC planning. This element (white exterior) may be reconsidered to further reduce prominence on the hillside. This proposal is unlikely to result in significant adverse effects on the SLQ The townscape of Stromness, its setting and its link with the sea, and as such, effects on the NSA would not be of national interest.”

4. Representations

- 4.1. A total of 32 valid representations have been submitted. It should be noted that, where more than one representation is received from a household, it is defined as one ‘valid representation’. There are incidences of multiple letters from a single person, and separate representations from multiple individuals within a single household. So, whilst less than the total number of individual letters received, 32, is the correct number of ‘valid representations’. Of those, 29 submitted are in objection, one is in support, and two are neutral.

4.2. 29 valid representations (objections) have been received from:

- Alistair Cameron, Craigholm, Back Road, Stromness, KW16 3AJ.
- Allyn Brown, 106a Victoria Street, Stromness, KW16 3BU.
- Archibald Paterson and Penny Paterson, Ashburn, Srathsteven, Brora, KW9 6NL.
- Caroline Haxton, Wester Greenside Farm, Newburgh Road, Abernethy, PH2 9LJ.
- Colin and Ishbel Borland, Bea House, Back Road, Stromness, KW16 3AW.
- Deborah Black, Oakbank, Sandwick, Stromness, KW16 3JE.
- Eildih McIntosh, 157 Maxwell Avenue, Glasgow, G61 1HT.
- Fiona Matheson, 90 Dundas Street, Stromness, KW16 3DA.
- Francis Sinclair, 4 Yorston Drive, Stromness, KW16 3ER.
- Graham Borland, 34 Hunters Way, Lochwinnoch, PA12 4BX.
- Ilona Wishart, 38 Grieveship Brae, Stromness, KW16 3BG.
- Joe Goldblatt, 15 / 6 East Parkside, Edinburgh, EH16 5XL.
- John Butterfield, Bring Deeps, Orphir, KW17 2RE.
- Josephine Jones, Moorside, Finstown, KW17 2JZ.
- Judy Gilbert, 3 Hoymansquoy, Stromness, KW16 3DR.
- Kate Shiner, 37 Copland's Drive, Stromness, KW16 3BN.
- Kim Whyte, 2 Grays Noust, Stromness, KW16 3EB.
- Lesley Clark, Newdale, Innertown, Stromness, KW16 3JP.
- Lesley Edinborough, 4 Springfield Crescent, Stromness, KW16 3AS.
- Liam Chalmers, Lee Farm, Stromness, KW16 3HU.
- Orkney Hyperbaric Trust, c/o Malcolm Thompson, The Bobby Forbes Unit, Stromness, KW16 3AW.
- Pauline Figliolini, 10 Kirkburn, Laurencekirk, AB30 1LG.
- Robert Gibbon, Naversdale, Orphir, Stromness, KW16 3HD.
- Roy Seatter, 4 St Peter's Park, Seatter, Stromness, KW16 3EH.
- Stromness Community Council, c/o Sandra Craigie, Billia Smari, Outertown, Stromness, KW16 3JP.
- SULA Diving, c/o Malcolm Thomson, Charles Clouston Building, ORIC, Stromness, KW16 3AW.
- Susan Paice, The Sycamores, 23 Church Road, Stromness, KW16 3BA
- Tracey Smallman, 32 Hamnavoe, Stromness, KW16 3JQ.
- Vivienne Macleod, Rosehill Cottage, Stromness, KW16 3HU.

4.3. Two valid representations (neutral comment) have been received from:

- Calum Miller, 13 Church Road, Stromness, KW16 3BA.
- Kevin Giles, Ellisland, Back Road, Stromness, KW16 3AJ.

4.4. One valid representation (supporting comment) has been received from:

- Cath Russell, EMEC Charles Clouston Building, Stromness, KW16 3AW.

4.5. Representations are on the following grounds:

- Loss of 24 long-stay public parking spaces in an area that has limited parking, impacting peak tourist seasons and local events, exacerbating existing problems.
- Further strain on narrow roads, aging drainage system, and limited capacity for further growth.
- Proposed “chevron” parking spaces on the north side of the access road to the hyperbaric chamber are in a small, awkward area where vehicles would have to reverse into a busy car park, increasing congestion and risk of obstructing emergency access.
- An increase in traffic at the Ashy Lane junction, potentially exacerbating existing visibility and safety issues for vehicles accessing nearby properties.
- Effects on neighbouring businesses – amenity, overlooking, overshadowing, privacy, impact on rental appeal.
- Residential amenity issues: overlooking, privacy, overshadowing, loss of daylight, noise pollution, increased traffic, and odour.
- Daylight and sunlight assessment underestimates the severity of overshadowing and loss of light.
- Scale, massing, and dominant profile are out of character with the townscape, causing harm to the landscape character and visual amenity of Stromness.
- Threat to the physical beauty of the area, which is integral to the experience of residents, visitors, and long-term guests.
- The 45-degree rule has not been applied to the daylight assessment.
- 45-degree pitched roof exceeds adjacent building heights and is therefore intrusive.
- From key public viewpoints, including from the sea, the development would appear visually incongruous and jarring, introducing a disjointed mix of architectural styles to a sensitive and prominent site.
- The character of the local area and the wider community enjoyment of the landscape will be diminished.
- Inadequate public engagement/consultation.

- Lack of comment from heritage bodies.
 - Affects the amenity of the conservation area.
 - May replicate and exacerbate the negative visual impact of the former primary school building.
 - The site is of significant historic and cultural value to the community; impact on the Stromness Conservation Area and the National Scenic Area.
 - Incompatible with the setting, and out of keeping with the character of Stromness.
 - The use of terracotta-coloured metal cladding, horizontal striping, flat roofs, roof terraces, and turf roofs is unsympathetic, visually intrusive, and inappropriate for the Orkney context.
 - The scale and form are excessive, overbearing, and likely to negatively affect the first impression of Stromness for visitors arriving by sea.
 - Failure to accord with the Stromness Urban Design Framework 2014.
 - Failure to accord with Policies 1 and 2 of the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017.
 - Failure to accord with National Planning Framework 4 Policies 1, 2, 3 and 14.
 - Inconsistency with planning outcomes.
 - Decrease in footfall, which would result in increased pressures on local businesses.
 - Construction pollution.
- 4.6. Several representations, including the neutral comments, suggested a redesign of the proposed development, comprising a reduction in scale and/or reusing and adapting existing buildings, citing environmental benefits and cost savings. It was also suggested to build at the rear of the property and include a pitched roof. A query was raised regarding impact on parking spaces.
- 4.7. Other matters were raised in relation to property values, necessity of development, the nature of the applicant, use of public funds, and land ownership. None of these matters are material planning considerations, and as such do not form part of the determination. Technical points were also raised in relation to public engagement and planning process.
- 4.8. Representations in support of the application raised the following matters:
- Support for the expansion of the campus, including potential to create functional, modern spaces for tenant organisations.
 - Opportunity to strengthen the identity of the campus by linking existing buildings.

- The development represents a positive step in showcasing the innovative work taking place in Stromness.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1. Planning applications

Reference	Proposal	Location	Decision	Date
19/433/PP.	Install replacement windows, and works to courtyard and entrance (resubmission of 19/301/PP).	Old Academy, Back Road, Stromness.	Approve.	01.03.20.
19/405/PP.	Install five electric vehicle charge points.	Old Academy, Back Road, Stromness.	Approve.	17.04.20.
19/301/PP.	Install replacement windows, and works to courtyard and entrance.	Old Academy, Back Road, Stromness.	Refuse.	15.11.19.
17/178/PP.	Extend, remodel existing main entrance, create a new entrance and hard landscaping.	Old Academy, Back Road, Stromness.	Approve.	03.10.17.
15/014/PP.	Change of use from office to education facility, install replacement door and install an air source heat pump.	Old Academy Business Centre, Back Road, Stromness.	Approve.	05.03.15.
02/350/PPF.	Change of Use, Part of Old Academy, Class 10 to Class 4.	Old Academy, Stromness.	Approve.	07.10.02.

6. Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

- 6.1. The full text of the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 and supplementary guidance can be read on the Council website [here](#).
- 6.2. National Planning Framework 4 can be read on the Scottish Government website [here](#).
- 6.3. The key policies, supplementary guidance and planning policy advice listed below are relevant to this application:
 - National Planning Framework 4:
 - Policy 2. Climate mitigation and adaptation.
 - Policy 3. Biodiversity.
 - Policy 6. Forestry, woodland and trees.
 - Policy 7. Historic assets and places.
 - Policy 9. Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty building.
 - Policy 11. Energy.
 - Policy 13. Sustainable transport.
 - Policy 14. Design, quality and place.
 - Policy 19. Heat and cooling.
 - Policy 21. Play, recreation and sport.
 - Policy 22. Flood risk and water management.
 - Policy 26. Business and industry.
 - Policy 27. City, town, local and commercial centres.
 - Orkney Local Development Plan 2017:
 - Policy 1: Criteria for All Development.
 - Policy 2: Design.
 - Policy 3: Settlements, Town Centres and Primary Retail Frontages.
 - Policy 4: Business, Industry and Employment.
 - Policy 7: Energy.
 - Policy 8: Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage.
 - Policy 9: Natural Heritage and Landscape.
 - Policy 11: Outdoor Sports, Recreation and Communities Facilities.
 - Policy 13: Flood Risk, SuDS and Waste Water Drainage.
 - Policy 14: Transport, Travel and Road Network Infrastructure.

- Supplementary Guidance:
 - Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage (2017).
 - Settlement Statements (2017).

7. Legislative Position

- 7.1. Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as amended (the Act) states, “Where, in making any determination under the Planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination is, unless material considerations indicate otherwise...to be made in accordance with that plan...”
- 7.2. Annex A of Planning Circular 3/2013: ‘development management procedures’ provides advice on defining a material consideration, and following a House of Lords’ judgement with regards the legislative requirement for decisions on planning applications to be made in accordance with the development plan, confirms the following interpretation: “If a proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations indicating that it should be refused, permission should be granted. If the proposal does not accord with the development plan, it should be refused unless there are material considerations indicating that it should be granted.”
- 7.3. Annex A continues as follows:
- The House of Lords’ judgement also set out the following approach to deciding an application:
 - Identify any provisions of the development plan which are relevant to the decision.
 - Interpret them carefully, looking at the aims and objectives of the plan as well as detailed wording of policies.
 - Consider whether or not the proposal accords with the development plan.
 - Identify and consider relevant material considerations for and against the proposal.
 - Assess whether these considerations warrant a departure from the development plan.
 - There are two main tests in deciding whether a consideration is material and relevant:
 - It should serve or be related to the purpose of planning. It should therefore relate to the development and use of land.

- It should relate to the particular application.
- The decision maker will have to decide what considerations it considers are material to the determination of the application. However, the question of whether or not a consideration is a material consideration is a question of law and so something which is ultimately for the courts to determine. It is for the decision maker to assess both the weight to be attached to each material consideration and whether individually or together they are sufficient to outweigh the development plan. Where development plan policies are not directly relevant to the development proposal, material considerations will be of particular importance.
- The range of considerations which might be considered material in planning terms is very wide and can only be determined in the context of each case. Examples of possible material considerations include:
 - Scottish Government policy and UK Government policy on reserved matters.
 - The National Planning Framework.
 - Designing Streets.
 - Scottish Government planning advice and circulars.
 - EU policy.
 - A proposed local development plan or proposed supplementary guidance.
 - Community plans.
 - The environmental impact of the proposal.
 - The design of the proposed development and its relationship to its surroundings.
 - Access, provision of infrastructure and planning history of the site.
 - Views of statutory and other consultees.
 - Legitimate public concern or support expressed on relevant planning matters.
- The planning system operates in the long term public interest. It does not exist to protect the interests of one person or business against the activities of another. In distinguishing between public and private interests, the basic question is whether the proposal would unacceptably affect the amenity and existing use of land and buildings which ought to be protected in the public interest, not whether owners or occupiers of neighbouring or other existing properties would experience financial or other loss from a particular development.

7.4. Where a decision to refuse an application is made, the applicant may appeal under section 47 of the Act. Scottish Ministers are empowered to make an award of expenses on appeal where one party's conduct is deemed to be unreasonable. Examples of such unreasonable conduct are given in Circular 6/1990 and include:

- Failing to give complete, precise and relevant reasons for refusal of an application.
- Reaching a decision without reasonable planning grounds for doing so.
- Not taking into account material considerations.
- Refusing an application because of local opposition, where that opposition is not founded upon valid planning grounds.

7.5. An award of expenses may be substantial where an appeal is conducted either by way of written submissions or a local inquiry.

Status of the Local Development Plan

7.6. Although the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 is “out-of-date” and has been since April 2022, it is still a significant material consideration when considering planning applications. The primacy of the plan should be maintained until a new plan is adopted. However, the weight to be attached to the Plan will be diminished where policies within the plan are subsequently superseded.

Status of National Planning Framework 4

7.7. National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was adopted by Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023, following approval by the Scottish Parliament in January 2023. The statutory development plan for Orkney consists of NPF4 and the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017 and its supplementary guidance. In the event of any incompatibility between a provision of NPF4 and a provision of the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017, NPF4 is to prevail as it was adopted later. It is important to note that NPF4 must be read and applied as a whole, and that the intent of each of the 33 policies is set out in NPF4 and can be used to guide decision-making.

7.8. In the current case, there is not considered to be any incompatibility between the provisions of NPF4 and the provisions of the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017, to merit any detailed assessment in relation to individual NPF4 policies.

8. Assessment

- 8.1. As noted in section 1 above, planning permission is sought for the alteration and extension of ORIC at the former Stromness Academy, Back Road, Stromness, as indicated in the Location Plan attached as Appendix 2 to this report. The works include the alteration and extension of the existing Block 3, and change of use of the building as extended, to create a mixed-use food and drink (Class 3), office (Class 4) and education (Class 10) facility, to be used in conjunction with the wider campus. The works also comprise the installation of air source heat pumps, and the installation of external wall insulation and air source heat pumps to the Charles Clouston Building. To the south of the site, proposed works include the reconfiguration and significant extension of existing car parking. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure would be installed, alongside associated hard and soft landscaping, including construction of a ramp and steps at the north-east corner of the campus.
- 8.2. The application site is within the settlement boundary of Stromness. It is within the Hoy and West Mainland National Scenic Area and is adjacent to the Stromness Conservation Area, and within its setting, particularly when viewed from land immediately adjacent or in a long view of the town centre from the sea or Garson to the east.
- 8.3. ORIC is a research and innovation campus including businesses and further education providers, and acts as a hub for a range of energy and low carbon expertise. The campus comprises the Robert Rendall building in the former primary school, and in the old academy buildings, the Charles Clouston building. The focus of the current application relates to the refurbishment and extension of the building known as Block 3, a detached two-storey traditionally constructed stone building with a slate roof and timber sash and case windows, located at the northern end of the Old Academy. The southern end of the campus is currently vacant and sloping towards Franklin Road. It is proposed to extend the existing car park to the south, and to that vacant area, and for the parking layout to be amended.

Principle

- 8.4. Policy 27 'City, town, local and commercial centres' of NPF4 encourages, promotes and facilitates development in town centres, with a policy outcome of creating centres that are vibrant, healthy, creative, enterprising, accessible and resilient places for people to live, learn, work, enjoy and visit. The Policy notes that proposals for uses which would generate significant footfall, including education facilities, are supported in existing town centres. That aligns with Policy 3

‘Settlements, Town Centres and Primary Retail Frontages’ of the Local Development Plan which applies a Town Centre First Principle, so that facilities which attract significant footfall are focused on town centre locations. The expansion of the campus, including building extension and reconfiguration of the grounds, is therefore acceptable in principle.

Access and Parking

- 8.5. When initially submitted, the proposed development did not include the now proposed additional car parking to the south. The extension to Block 3 has two main effects in terms of car parking provision: firstly, it is in-part built within an existing car park and so results in the loss of those parking spaces, and secondly, it is a relatively large extension over multiple floors, and creates its own parking demand.
- 8.6. Roads Services initially objected to the planning application, in relation to the car parking provision, and with reference to the National Roads Development Guide as specified in Policy 14 ‘Transport, Travel and Road Network Structure’ of the Local Development Plan. The expansion of the proposal description and proposed works to include the car parking to the south was a material change to the application and was subject to full re-publication. However, it has the effect of providing sufficient additional parking spaces to satisfy the previous concerns of Roads Services.
- 8.7. The threat of loss of parking spaces has been raised in representations, including in relation to town centre businesses. The operator of the hyperbaric chamber also objected, based on a now superseded proposed car park layout. Both matters are addressed by the current situation, which provides adequate additional spaces, and where previous restricted access to the hyperbaric chamber has been amended. The final configuration of the car park, including the location of parking bays, but also pedestrian routes and other markings, would be subject to planning condition, but in all circumstances maintaining adequate parking provision.
- 8.8. It is also relevant in terms of parking provision that the development is in the town centre, and public transport is available in the vicinity. The local road network is also raised in objection; Roads Services has no objections in relation to additional traffic or the safety of road users. Similarly, no objection is received from Roads Services in terms of pedestrian safety, including in relation to proposed amended pedestrian access arrangements and to the campus.

Residential Amenity - Noise

- 8.9. Noise during operation of the extended campus facilities is not anticipated to be significantly different from the campus as it exists currently, in terms of typical activities carried out. Noise from air source heat pumps would be controlled by planning condition. Construction works would also be subject to planning condition, including hours of work and a Construction Method Statement. In terms of noise, the development is therefore considered to comply with Policy 1 'Criteria for All Development' of the Local Development Plan.

Residential Amenity - Privacy and Overlooking

- 8.10. The proposed extension is located to the north of Block 3, towards the boundary with the public footpath. Most windows face east, over Franklin Road and towards the sea. In that direction, adequate separation comprising the campus grounds and public road is provided between the building and any neighbouring houses. To the north, the proposed three-storey part of the extension has windows facing towards the neighbouring property which is a house with a self-catering unit in its grounds. All windows in that north elevation would serve office spaces, and all offices have sufficient outlook in other elevations. Those windows can therefore be controlled by planning condition to be obscure glazed and non-opening. The other potential source of overlooking is from the proposed terrace, in the top floor at the north-east corner of the building. Users of the terrace would have a principal view east, over the harbour, but would also have some view to the north. This would be over part of the garden of the neighbouring property, but at sufficient distance and angle from both residential parts of the property – the house and the self-catering unit – that there is no unacceptable impact on privacy.

Residential Amenity – Daylight and Sunlight

- 8.11. Impact on daylight is a key part of the objection from the neighbouring property to the north, mainly in terms of the self-catering unit in the grounds. This is principally due to the scale and proximity of the block of the extension at the north end of the site, and the vicinity of the self-catering unit to the south boundary of the neighbouring property. In response to the site arrangement and representations, a daylighting and sunlighting analysis was requested by the Planning Authority.
- 8.12. The analysis included impact on daylight, sunlight and outlook, following the recommendations set in Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance 209 on daylight, sunlight and outlook: "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A guide to good practice [second edition]". The guidelines given are intended for rooms in nearby dwellings where daylight is required.

- 8.13. The daylighting analysis measures any reduction in the total amount of skylight to a room by finding the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) at the centre of each main window. Two main windows in the self-catering unit were analysed – the ground floor kitchen window and the angled rooflight of the first floor bedroom.
- 8.14. This report includes that the proposed development passes the recommendations set out in the BR 209 guidance, as included in tables within the submitted analysis.
- 8.15. On the basis the development meets BRE recommendations, daylight and sunlight impact are not considered unacceptable, and the development accords with Policy 1 ‘Criteria for All Development’ of the Local Development Plan.

Surface Water Drainage

- 8.16. Initial surface water drainage proposals were subject to objection from Engineering Services. The complexity of the management of surface water increased when the additional car parking was added to the development proposal. The key Engineering Services requirement was for post-development surface water discharges from previously developed areas of the site to be equal to or lower than current discharge rates and for the discharge rate from the previously undeveloped portion of the site (the car parking at the southern end) to not exceed the greenfield runoff rate during worst case events with return periods of one year to 200 years.
- 8.17. The applicant commissioned a drainage engineer for the surface water drainage design and calculations. That resulted in submission of a detailed description of the proposed drainage system, including surface water, SuDS and alterations to the existing drainage, and explanation of the strategy to divert surface water from the northern end to the southern end of the development. Maintenance responsibilities and schedules of the maintenance are also provided, to be carried out by the appropriate responsible organisation(s) for all surface water drainage elements including SuDS devices.
- 8.18. Topography and ground conditions at the southern end of the site added to the complexity of the surface water drainage design. Notwithstanding this, a revised Drainage Statement and associated drawings were submitted in May 2025 which meet the requirements of Engineering Services. The development therefore accords with Policy 22 ‘Flood risk and water management’ of NPF4, and Policy 13 ‘Flood Risk, SuDS and Waste Water Drainage’ of the Local Development Plan.

Landscaping and Biodiversity Enhancement

- 8.19. In conjunction with the proposed car park alterations and the ground works required to create the additional car parking at the southern end of the site, a landscaping strategy is proposed. This is in part to meet design, appearance and landscaping requirements from a visual perspective, but also to incorporate biodiversity enhancement measures as required by Policy 3 'Biodiversity' of NPF4.
- 8.20. The approach taken to landscaping is appropriate, including wildflower meadow creation, and planting of shrubs, hedging and trees, mainly around the additional car parking, but also the eastern boundary to Franklin Road and around the extended building at the north end of the site. The extent of planting and habitat enhancement proposed is sufficient to meet the requirements of Policy 3 of NPF4. To ensure adequate protection of existing established trees within the site in conjunction with new planting, and to provide full control over finalised landscaping design, notwithstanding the submitted planning plan, final landscaping would be controlled by planning condition.

Design Including National Scenic Area and Setting of the Conservation Area

- 8.21. The most significant element of the proposed development is the extension of Block 3 to the north. Working with the sloping ground levels at the site which falls from west to east, the proposed extension comprises a three-storey rectangular plan block to the north with a pitched roof, and a two storey, flat roofed linking block between the original stone Block 3 and the taller pitched roof part of the extension to the north. The flat roofed part of the building has a roof terrace. The flat roof form also projects east towards Franklin Road, from the east gable of the pitched roof block at the north end of the site (the part of the extension referred to above regarding privacy, in relation to the roof terrace).
- 8.22. The development would involve some alterations to the existing form of Block 3, including removal of a large two-storey wing on the west elevation, facing Back Road, and removal of the single storey porch on the front, east elevation, in both locations to be replaced with the flat roofed part of the extension wrapping around the original form.
- 8.23. A mix of materials and finishes are proposed across the different parts of the building. The original Block 3, where retained, would be maintained with the stone walls visible. The flat roofed part of the building would be glass across almost the entirety of the front, east elevation with use of anthracite/black window frames, and a horizontal matching coloured strip separating the floors. The view towards the glazing would be broken by a series of timber 'fins' placed across the frontage,

confirmed as a toned-down weathered timber finish. The fins would be at irregular placement, and across parts of the first floor, the fins would be placed at different angles rather than vertically as is the case in other parts of the building. The glazing would also be broken up by columns, visible across the frontage and supporting the small area of the third floor accessed from the roof terrace. These columns would be a cyan colour (blue), a colour used in corporate branding for the campus.

- 8.24. The pitched roof block at the north end of the extension is also a mix of materials. The main part of the block with the pitched roof would have a pale terracotta cladding, matching on the walls and roof. This is a similar colour to that used elsewhere within the campus. The flat roofed projection off the east gable of that pitched roof block would be an 'oyster white' render (punctuated by the dark window frames to match the remainder of the extension). That oyster white would also match the colour of replacement timber windows in the original Block 3.
- 8.25. The range of buildings has a key role in the setting of Stromness, constructed of traditional materials and sitting on high ground above the harbour at the core of the town, with the earliest part dating to the 1870s. Block 3 is a later addition to the range, of similar dressed stone construction with Welsh slate roof and timber sash and case windows, with ornamented details, that includes extended skew putts and finials, and a '1912' carved date stone in the gable of the entrance porch. A key characteristic of the buildings, like much of Stromness, is the simplicity of form, generally based on rectangular plans with a pitched roof. Relatively large-scale public buildings have been added to the Stromness townscape in recent years and decades, which follow that approach of form but do so using contemporary materials. Notable examples are the Pier Arts Centre and the Warehouse Buildings including the public library. Prominent traditional buildings can be extended using modern materials therefore, whilst protecting the character of the original, but that must be done sensitively.
- 8.26. The key policy tests for this are Policy 14 'Design, quality and place' of NPF4 which provides support for development proposals which are designed to improve the quality of an area, and Policy 2 'Design' of the Local Development Plan which requires that new development must reinforce the distinctive identity of Orkney's built environment and be sympathetic to the character of its local area, and must have a positive effect on the appearance and amenity of the area.
- 8.27. The use of a simple pitched roof block at the north end of the extension is an appropriate approach, reflecting the orientation of other parts of the range of buildings, which includes both frontages and gables facing east towards the harbour. Like the other examples provided in the town, that simplicity of form is

aided by use of matching materials on the wall and roof. The brighter red included in originally submitted elevations has been toned down to the light terracotta now proposed. The simplicity of form of that part of the extension is, however, diminished by the flat roof projection on the prominent, east elevation both in terms of form – by having a prominent flat roof dominating the elevation – and also in terms of the colour palette – resulting in an oyster white rendered wall breaking up the more traditional gable form.

- 8.28. Using traditional pitched roof forms to enclose or ‘book end’ more contemporary flat roof forms is a common approach, so that the traditional form at each end remains dominant. In this case, the extent of the flat roofed part of the building is such that it competes with the more traditional forms, including at Block 3 where it encloses part of the original frontage and involves the demolition of the ornamented entrance porch. In conjunction with simplicity of form, it is often simplicity of materials and colours that aids the integration of new development with an existing historic built environment. In this case, the proposed development would result in a mix of pitched and prominent flat roofs, introduction of a roof terrace, terracotta metal cladding to the north, sitting alongside the traditional slate roof of the original block, a large expanse of glazing, broken up by timber fins including at angles, which adds a complexity not typical of traditional buildings or their setting, an area of render at the north end, and dark window frame alongside light timber frames in the original building. Without the extent of glazing, the elevation seen from Back Road also includes multiple materials and finishes.
- 8.29. It is also relevant that the building is located within the Hoy and West Mainland National Scenic Area. Policy 9 ‘Natural Heritage and Landscape’ of the Local Developer Plan requires that, “iii. Development that affects the National Scenic Area (NSA) will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that: a. the proposal will not have a significant effect on the overall integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been designated; or b. any such adverse effects are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of national importance”.
- 8.30. In its consultation response, NatureScot confirms that “we do not consider that it would raise issues of National Interest in relation to its landscape, visual or cumulative effects. This is not to say that the development would not result in significant landscape or visual effects, rather that NatureScot does not judge these effects to meet our threshold in respect of our national remit for landscapes”. The consultation response includes acknowledgement of some design mitigation: “We consider there to be sufficient design considerations proposed to reduce the prominence of the development and integrate it with the surrounding townscape,

namely the consideration of scale, use of timber clad 'fins' to reduce reflectivity of the facade and the re-use of stone material". However, in the context of the rendered part of the building in particular, it is noted that materials can increase prominence, "In Stromness, buildings with light/white exteriors tend to be located around the harbour; the design statement addendum states that colour and textures are to be coordinated between HRI Munro and OIC planning. This element (white exterior) may be reconsidered to further reduce prominence on the hillside".

- 8.31. The design of the development and its impact on Stromness was raised in many representations. It is considered that a building of the scale proposed can be accommodated in that setting, in part due to the scale of the Old Academy range of buildings and acknowledging that it is already made up of buildings of different periods. However, when a building of that scale in such a prominent location is proposed, it must be well designed to ensure it meets the test of reinforcing the distinctive identity of Orkney's built environment and being sympathetic to and having a positive effect on the character of its surroundings. The prominence of the flat roofed part of the extension on the east elevation, including the loss of the original front porch, and the range of colours and materials proposed, in combination with the complexity added to the elevation by the introduction of the fins, are not considered to reinforce a distinctive Orkney or Stromness character of building. To be clear, that conclusion is not reached simply because modern materials are used – as noted already, contemporary materials can be used to create deliberate distinction, whilst being sympathetic to neighbouring traditional form – but is reached based on the design submitted.
- 8.32. The application must be considered as submitted (not an exercise in what may otherwise be designed). Whilst features including the porch would be lost, the development does secure a future for Block 3. In terms of the National Scenic Area landscape designation, NatureScot has confirmed that the development would not raise issues of national interest in relation to its landscape, visual or cumulative effects. The development is considered to comply in part with Policy 2, in terms of scale and some use of materials, but fails in terms of reinforcing the distinct identity of Orkney's built environment due to much of the detailing. That specific policy assessment must ultimately be taken in the context of a balanced approach of all relevant planning policies, and other material planning considerations. That balance includes consideration of whether any negative assessment is of such weight that it would merit refusal of the application.

Setting of the Conservation Area

- 8.33. As noted above, the application site is immediately west of the boundary of Stromness Conservation Area. Also as noted, the range of buildings forming the Old Academy are prominent in the setting of the town centre, and therefore the core of the conservation area. Stromness is relatively unusual in terms of the importance of views into the conservation area, including from the sea, as well as views within and from the area. Policy 7 'Historic assets and places' of NPF4 notes that development will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. The development would secure a future of most of Block 3 which is the part in closest association with the remainder of the Old Academy, and in longer views, including from the harbour, the modern parts of the building would be seen in context with the former primary school. In terms of the setting of the conservation area specifically, the impact would not be so great to merit refusal of the application.

Other Works

- 8.34. Other works are included in the proposed development, including installation of air source heat pumps not considered in detail above, external insulation on a relatively modern part of the campus which is already rendered, installation of a ramp and steps, and electric vehicle charging infrastructure. These works are generally non-contentious, and adequate details have been provided.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1. The development is acceptable in principle, as the expansion of an existing educational facility within the settlement boundary. In terms of technical matters of access and parking and surface water drainage, these have been subject to detailed assessment by Roads Services and Engineering Services, with no objection subject to conditions to secure construction and details. Daylight and sunlight impact has been assessed to an industry standard and pass the analysis. Noise from both construction and operation would be controlled by planning condition. It is considered there would be no unacceptable adverse privacy impact. Sufficient indicative landscaping and biodiversity enhancement measures have been provided, and would be secured by planning condition, including retention of established planting.
- 9.2. Those matters are balanced against the design of the development, which includes many acceptable elements, including general policy support for a deliberately contrasting use of materials and an extension of historic buildings in conjunction with appropriate scale and form, and which forms at least part of the proposed

extension. However, other elements of the proposed design are not considered to enhance the distinctive characteristics of Orkney's built heritage, given the prominence of the flat roofed part of the building, and the complex use of colours and materials. The development would have an impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area and would be visible in a prominent position in the national scenic area, but neither to such an extent to merit refusal.

- 9.3. Ultimately it is a balanced judgement, of the impacts of the development on neighbouring properties and on the townscape generally and associated designations, and some diminishing of the architectural features of Block 3, balanced against the benefits that would arise including safeguarding a use for the historic Block 3 overall, and the enhancement of a key facility within Stromness town centre, and which has general policy support. Notwithstanding identified impacts, on balance the development is considered acceptable with regards the relevant policies of National Planning Framework 4 and the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017. There are no material considerations including those raised in the objections that outweigh this conclusion.

For Further Information please contact:

Jamie Macvie, Service Manager (Development Management), Email
jamie.macvie@orkney.gov.uk

Implications of Report

1. **Financial:** None.
2. **Legal:** Detailed in section 7 above.
3. **Corporate Governance:** In accordance with the Scheme of Administration, determination of this application is delegated to the Planning Committee.
4. **Human Resources:** None.
5. **Equalities:** Not relevant.
6. **Island Communities Impact:** Not relevant.
7. **Links to Council Plan:** Not relevant.
8. **Links to Local Outcomes Improvement Plan:** Not relevant.
9. **Environmental and Climate Risk:** None.
10. **Risk:** If Members are minded to refuse the application, it is imperative that clear reasons for proposing the refusal of planning permission on the basis of the proposal being contrary to the development plan policy and the officer's recommendation be given and minuted. This is in order to provide clarity in the case of a subsequent planning appeal or judicial review against the Planning Committee's decision. Failure to give clear planning reasons for the decision could lead to the decision being overturned or quashed. In addition, an award of costs could be made

against the Council. This could be on the basis that it is not possible to mount a reasonable defence of the Council's decision.

- 11. Procurement:** None.
- 12. Health and Safety:** None.
- 13. Property and Assets:** None.
- 14. Information Technology:** None.
- 15. Cost of Living:** None.

List of Background Papers

Orkney Local Development Plan 2017, available [here](#).

National Planning Framework 4, available [here](#).

Appendix

Appendix 1 – Planning conditions.

Appendix 2 – Location Plan.

Appendix 1.

01. The development hereby approved, to which this planning permission relates, must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date on which the permission is granted, which is the date of this decision notice. If development has not commenced within this period, this planning permission shall lapse.

Reason: In accordance with Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended, which limits the duration of planning permission.

02. No development, including any site clearance works or alterations to the existing building, shall commence until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide for:

- The means of access to and from the site for plant, machinery and all construction traffic.
- Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors.
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials.
- Construction compound.
- Welfare facilities.
- Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development.
- Stockpiling of materials.
- The erection and maintenance of security hoarding.
- Construction lighting.
- Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction.
- A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
- Where relevant in terms of occupation, the phasing of the development.

For the avoidance of doubt there shall be no burning or burying of waste within the site.

Thereafter, and throughout all construction phases, the site and development shall be undertaken wholly in accordance with the approved Construction Method Statement.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties and occupants.

03. Notwithstanding the details included within the site plan hereby approved, no development shall commence until a Scheme of Landscaping for all hard and soft landscaping is submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority. The Scheme of Landscaping shall include:

- The location of all proposed tree, shrub, hedging and grass planting.
- A planting schedule comprising layout, number, density, species, height of all trees and shrubs and seed mix of all grass areas.
- Retention of existing established trees and shrubs, unless expressly approved to be removed.

- The location, design and materials of all hard landscaping works, including walls, fences and gates.
- A timescale for implementation and completion of all soft and hard landscaping contained in the Scheme of Landscaping, including all tree and shrub planting in the first planting season following commencement of development. All hard landscaping shall be completed wholly in accordance with approved details prior to first occupation of any part of the development, in conjunction with the requirements of condition 05.

All soft and hard landscaping shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the approved Scheme of Landscaping, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Planning Authority.

Any tree or shrub planting which, within a period of five years from planting, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, is dead, dying, diseased or severely damaged, shall be replaced by a tree or shrub of similar size and species to that originally planted, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the development shall be maintained in accordance with the details included in the Scheme of Landscaping throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the area and residential amenity and existing established planting.

04. Notwithstanding external finishes included in the drawings hereby approved, no development shall commence until full details of all external detailing (including construction drawings where applicable), finishes, materials and colours (with RAL colour specified where applicable) of the development hereby approved has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the exterior of the development shall be finished wholly in accordance with approved details.

These details include, but are not limited to:

- Timber windows and doors in the original openings.
- Window frames.
- Cladding detail between floors at glazing.
- Doors and thresholds.
- Fins.
- Columns.
- Render.
- Balustrades.
- Sinusoidal cladding,
- Rainwater goods.
- Any exterior lighting.
- Retaining Walls.
- Steps.
- Handrails.
- Making good boundary wall at openings.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the area.

05. Notwithstanding the car park layout included in the site plan hereby approved, no development shall commence until full details of the layout of the car park has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority, in conjunction with Roads Services. These details shall include the layout of parking bays for both the existing and additional car parking, pedestrian walkways/routes within the car park, and lighting proposals which shall include street lighting columns. Thereafter, the development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the car park is laid out wholly in accordance with approved details.

Reason: To protect the safety of users of the car park, and to ensure the provision of parking bays, and manoeuvrability within the car park are executed to an appropriate standard.

06. No alterations shall be carried out to the existing Block 3 and no ground works shall commence until a method statement for the dismantling/removal and subsequent storage of historic features and material has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority. This method statement shall include the down taking of the entrance porch and west projection, and shall also include, but not be limited to, retention, salvage and storage of:

- Dressed stone from the down takings of Block 3.
- Stone from demolished sections of stone dykes including pillars.
- Skew putts, skew stones, and finials.
- The '1912' date stone.
- Flagstones, including those forming paths at the north and south ends of the building.

Where relevant, the method statement should also include the re-use of the materials in the final development. All removals, storage (and where relevant, re-use) of materials shall be in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To ensure the retention of an important architectural detail of the existing building.

07. Total noise from the air source heat pumps hereby approved shall not exceed NR25 within any residential property outwith the development, where NR25 is the Noise Rating Curve at 25 (noise measurements to be made with a window of any residential property out with the development open no more than 50 millimetres).

Reason: To protect any nearby residents from excessive noise disturbance from the air source heat pumps.

08. Prior to occupation or use of any part of the development hereby approved, all surface water drainage works hereby approved, shall be constructed wholly in accordance with the approved drawings and submitted documents, including the 'Drainage Statement' revision dated 05/05/25. Thereafter, and throughout the lifetime of the development, the drainage shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details, and in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and be compliant with the guidance set out in the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.

Reason: To ensure the provision of an adequate surface water drainage system and to accord with Policy 13B - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) of Orkney Local Development Plan 2017.

09. All windows in the north elevation of the development hereby approved shall be opaque glazed and fixed (non-opening) throughout the lifetime of the development. No windows shall be installed until full details of the opacity have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority. Thereafter, only approved glazing shall be installed. Thereafter, the glazing shall be retained in accordance with approved details throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the neighbouring property to the north, from risk of overlooking from approved windows.

10. Hours of work during the construction of the development hereby approved, involving the use of machinery and powered tools, or any other operation, for example hammering, that would generate noise audible beyond the boundary of the site, shall be restricted to 07:30 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or the Christmas or New Year Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the residential amenity of the area and in order to reduce any possible nuisance arising to nearby residents during the construction of this development.



- Site Area Boundary Line
12 690m²
- Ownership Boundary Line
- New External Insulation

This drawing is to be read in conjunction with:

T7294 500 01
Proposed Car Parking Plan

234-PP-104, 234-PP-106
Proposed Landscaping Plans

151089-PC-1016, 1017, 1018, 1022, 1024, 1025
Proposed Engineers' Plans and Specifications

006124-00056
Proposed Car Park Lighting Plan and Specification

6	Refs to car parking and landscaping	18/03/2024
5	Car Parking details added	02/12/2024
4	Parking & Roofplan updated	29/11/24
3	Ramp Added	20/02/2024
2	Block 3 updated	08-Dec-23
1	Issued to client review	08-Nov-23
No.	Revision	Date

HRI Munro
architecture

62 Academy Street Inverness IV1 1LP
t: 01463 240066 f: 01463 717247
admin@hri-architects.com
www.hri-architects.com

Project Stage		Planning	
Project Title / Address		Phase 2, Building 3 ORIC Stromness	
Drawing Title		Proposed Site / Block Plan	
Project Lead By	Project No	T-7294	
Drawn By	Scale @ A1	1:500	
Checked By	Drawing No.	Rev No.	
Date	003	06	
© HRI Munro Architecture Ltd. All rights reserved.			

Mapping contents © Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100035207

1 Site / Block Plan
Scale: 1:500

