
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING held at The Village Hall, Dalwhinnie on Friday 5th September 2008 at 11.30am

PRESENT

Eric Baird
Stuart Black
Duncan Bryden
Nonie Coulthard
Jaci Douglas
Dave Fallows
Lucy Grant
David Green
Marcus Humphrey
Bob Kinnaird
Bruce Luffman
Eleanor Mackintosh

Ian MacKintosh
Anne MacLean
Alastair MacLennan
Mary McCafferty
William McKenna
Fiona Murdoch
Sandy Park
Andrew Rafferty
Richard Stroud
Susan Walker
Ross Watson

In Attendance:

Murray Ferguson
Andrew Harper
Jane Hope

Andy Rinning
Claire Ross
Hamish Trench

Apologies:

Geva Blackett
Drew Hendry

Welcome and Introduction

1. The Convener welcomed everyone to the meeting at Dalwhinnie, noting that the Board had held a community engagement meeting the previous night at Laggan Wolftrax. This mountain bike facility, a partnership between the Laggan Forest Trust and Forest Enterprise, was making an outstanding contribution to the community. Although there were some concerns from a few businesses, the facility appeared to be well-visited, and hold potential for further development and benefits to local businesses. The Convener also noted that he had earlier in the day been to Laggan Primary School to engage some of the pupils in a role play exercise, giving them some understanding of what it was like to make decisions on difficult issues where there were many competing interests.

Minutes of Last Meeting – approval

2. Minutes of the last meeting on the 11th July were approved with one minor change, namely to note that Fiona Spencer of the Scottish Government had been in attendance for items 1 and 2.

Matters Arising

3. With reference to Paper 6, paragraph (i), Andrew Harper reported that he had taken up with the ACDMO the need to be more explicit in its published materials in references to the National Park and the environmental quality criteria associated with use of the Brand. The ACDMO had agreed this point.
4. With reference to page 7, paragraph 10, Andrew Harper reported that the Chamber of Commerce had engaged a consultant (assisted by financial support from the CNPA) to develop a proposal, working with the DMOs in the Park for a Collaborative Business Working Model. There had been some slight slippage in the timetable and the intention was now to have the report finished by mid to end October, rather than September. The aim was to bring this, and associated proposals, to the next available Board meeting – if not the one at the end of October, then the November Board discussion slot would be used to hold a formal Board meeting. Further to this, David Green noted that as a follow up to the Board meeting in Braemar, he had held an informal discussion with a small group of Board members to bring them up to speed on these tourism issues. The view had been taken that it was quite right that the industry should be leading on this issue with support from the Park Authority, and it was better to get the right outcome even if this meant a small delay. The Convener was currently engaging with the Local Authorities and enterprise networks to ensure they also understood the rationale behind this work, given that there had been some suggestions that the Park Authority was imposing a particular solution.

Declarations of Interests

4. Lucy Grant declared in relation to Paper 1 that she was a member of the AOCC representing the Laggan Community, but not an AOCC Director. She noted this point for the record, and felt there was no need to leave the discussion of paper 1.

CNPA's Approach to Community Engagement (Paper 1)

5. Andrew Harper and Claire Ross introduced the paper which provided an overview of the CNPA's approach to Community Engagement and following a review of this, sought the Board's decision on several related matters. The CNPA had always recognised the vital role communities played in helping to deliver the aims of the National Park and therefore placed strong emphasis on actively engaging with communities through a number of mechanisms. Staff had recently engaged a number of Board members and a number of key stakeholders in a review of how these various mechanisms fitted together and identified possible changes. The paper in front of the Board was the result of that review.
6. The word "communities" was understood to have several elements:
 - a) Geographical, eg Grantown-on-Spey and its immediate vicinity.
 - b) Communities of interest, eg Ceilidh Trail, mountain bikes.
 - c) Communities of identity eg young people.
7. It was important to engage effectively because these were vital partners in contributing to the delivery of various frameworks that were set either at a national level (Scottish Government Performance Framework) or a more local level (National Park Plan, Community Planning Partnership Plans etc). A number of different ways of engaging were identified in the ladder of participation:
 - 1) Giving information (eg Parklife; LBBT and CAP)
 - 2) Consultation (being clear what was being asked and why, and what could and couldn't be changed)
 - 3) Deciding together
 - 4) Acting together (eg Community Planning Partnerships)
 - 5) Supporting individual community initiatives (eg Grant Schemes such as Community Climate Change Challenge Fund)
8. In practice engaging with communities effectively worked in a number of ways:
 - a) Involving communities.
 - b) Planning with communities (communities need to be engaged from the start of a process)
 - c) Support and methods (making it easy to engage)
 - d) Working with others.

9. Annex 2 of the paper set out proposed CNPA Community Engagement Standards which had been developed through consultation as a more user friendly version of the national standards. These had been trialed and it was felt that they were appropriate for adoption by the Park Authority. These standards for engagement were important as a way of promoting good practice, and offering a way of tapping into the resource of knowledge and expertise in communities. If adopted by partners they also would ensure a consistent approach, and hopefully avoid overburdening communities with consultation.

10. The paper:

- a) presented an overall framework for community engagement and support, recognising the existence of Community Planning Partnerships as a nation-wide statutory process;
- b) sought approval for continued CNP grant support to the Association of Cairngorms Communities as a way of providing some added value to, but not duplicating the work of Community Planning Partnerships;
- c) it sought the Board's approval to adopting the locally tailored national standards for community engagement to guide how the CNPA engages with communities.

11. In discussion the following points were made

- a) The issue of over-consultation was recognised. The question was asked whether the AOCC could help to take the burden off individual communities. However, it was recognised that the main way of consulting was now through the Community Planning Partnerships and it was important not to duplicate existing mechanisms. It was also noted that although there was a degree of complaint about over-consultation, many people would be much more concerned if they were not consulted. It was important that local communities were given the opportunity to form a view as an individual community and feed in to consultations; any attempt to centralise ran the risk of diluting this opportunity at an individual community level.
- b) Whatever the mechanisms of engagement with communities, inevitably the success or otherwise was often down to individuals. There were instances where individuals or groups such as AOCC failed to feed back to their individual communities. In reality it was always going to be difficult to persuade individuals that it was worth turning up and taking part in community councils or other community engagement mechanisms.
- c) The AOCC had done a good job in the early years of the National Park. It was noted that their profile had declined somewhat since then. In addition Community Planning Partnerships had been introduced as a national-wide statutory process facilitated by local authorities to help public agencies work together with the

community to plan and deliver better services, which made a real difference to people's lives. It had been recognised that community councils had in the past been expected to do too much on their own. Although Community Planning Partnerships had had a slow start, they were now beginning to work and people were seeing them as worthwhile. Although one should not generalise, undoubtedly some community councils were seen as not worthwhile, where they comprised individuals with their own agendas not representative of the wider community.

- d) The significance of Community Planning Partnerships was well understood and the CNPA was working with them. The recent Community Needs Initiative had been done within and through the Community Planning Partnership structures. The question in relation to future funding of the AOCC had to focus on whether or not there were things that needed to be done on a pan-Park basis, and which were not currently being undertaken by the four Community Planning Partnerships covering the Park. Any funding to the AOCC would be to ensure the AOCC was clearly focused on a limited and targeted number of deliverables which could not be done through the Community Planning Partnerships. It was noted that the AOCC had undertaken an internal review of its organisation and had looked very hard at how it could change internally, including looking at how it could ensure better feedback to individual communities.
- e) It was recognised that Community Planning Partnerships were not all working properly yet but even so, there was no question of the AOCC substituting or replacing these.
- f) The AOCC should certainly not become a central consultative repository – it was not envisaged in the paper.
- g) It was recognised that the majority of people on community councils wanted to do the best for their community, and while arrangements were not perfect these were all volunteers with few resources.
- h) The AOCC had gone through a period of not knowing clearly their role. After helping to set up the National Park they had slightly lost their way. The recent internal organisational review showed that the members of the AOCC wanted to do something positive and were prepared to look very hard at how best to change the organisation and how they could link back to the various communities. The AOCC had a potential role as a conduit for information – not to produce a single view on behalf of all communities, but to ensure sharing of information in both directions. It provided the only forum that brought together all the communities of the Park; it was a good networking vehicle and provided the opportunity for discussion on issues facing individual communities.

- i) Any funding to the AOCC should focus on specific projects and identified deliverables, and it would be important to monitor effectiveness of delivery.
- j) It was noted that the inclusion of Blair Atholl in the AOCC had been helpful, as had been some new membership.
- k) The incorporation of the Aims of the Park into the work of Community Planning Partnerships was an interesting issue. Community Plans were all written in different ways; however there were no real tensions between the National Park Plan and the Community Plans as consultation on each had reinforced the other. However, with the coming of Single Outcome Agreements for Community Planning Partnerships, there was a challenge for the CNPA to ensure that the National Park Plan was embedded in these.
- l) It was noted that the recent Community Needs Assessment conducted with Grantown and its immediate surroundings had been done with the support of the Community Planning Partnerships and the AOCC. It had worked well because it did not involve just the "usual suspects". The AOCC had played an important role. The assessment had generated real outcomes although these had not been broadcast widely enough yet. It was noted that the Community Needs Assessment was at a very local level and in this respect was probably a more effective means of engagement than the Highland Council Ward Forums.
- m) Twelve years ago a total review of Community Councils had been promised by Central Government and by Highland Council; this apparently had never been delivered. Community councils had a very difficult role with very few resources; Government was complex and sorely in need of being more joined up, while individual community councils were run by volunteers. The real challenge in the Park was to help communities fulfil their function; not remove funding just when it was most needed. Removing funding at this stage would send completely the wrong message.
- n) The AOCC did provide something of a pan-Park voice and helped create a sense of National Park Community. Now was not the right time to remove funding. However, any funding provided had to be associated with a very clear articulation of what the AOCC's role was for. Paragraph 22 of the paper set out the AOCC's objectives from their draft Business Plan (May 2008) – this was felt to be ambitious.
- o) Paragraph 15 was capable of misinterpretation; it was not intended to imply that the directly elected Board members were not already playing a full part by attending community meetings and events; it was merely stating it was the expectation of these Board members. The question of whether there should be a job description for directly elected members was a separate issue.

- p) Consultation fatigue was seen as being more related to the sense of nothing happening following consultation. It was noted that feedback was an essential part of engagement standards and needed emphasising. It was also noted that particularly in respect of the Community Needs Initiative, it was important to publicise much more effectively those things that were delivered as a direct result of the consultation.
- q) It was vital to avoid duplication of the work of the Community Planning Partnerships – perceived duplication as much as actual duplication. Unless this was emphasised there was a severe danger of losing the partnership of local authorities in the area of the Park otherwise the rationale for local authorities continuing to fund activities in the Park would be lost.
- r) It was noted that there were only two areas of Scotland with National Parks; all areas of Scotland had local authorities and community councils, but only two had National Parks as well. The issue therefore was the additionality of National Parks, and in this context the question was what the Park could bring for the benefit of communities as much as what communities could help to bring to the delivery of the Park.
- s) A real issue for most community councils was meeting overload.
- t) It was noted that the Government was consulting on a model constitution for community councils.
- u) There was an assumption that community engagement was an inherently good thing; however that depended on what you wanted to do with. It was essential to be clear on the ultimate objectives. The real issue in this paper was how the proposal allowed better delivery of the National Park Aims, and how best to achieve actions as a result of the engagement. It was right to support the AOCC provided it was clear that they were helping to deliver the Park Aims and the National Park Plan. However, this should not be a replacement for engagement with local authorities and the Community Planning Partnerships.
- v) There was some discussion about the Community Engagement Standards at Annex 2. It was suggested that the “terms of reference” needed to be clear. This was seen to be implicit in Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Annex 2 which essentially were about any engagement being very clear at the start about its procedures, timescales, etc.
- w) Community Councils and the AOCC should themselves adopt the standards in Annex 2.
- x) The AOCC would not be sufficient on its own and there was need for community development work in addition.
- y) Not an issue for the AOCC, but for the overall framework, it was suggested that engagement outside the Park an important task; so far the debate concentrated on engagement inside the Park. It was noted that a project was underway with Loch Lomond and the

Trossachs National Park Authority and SNH looking at engagement outside the Park.

- z) The debate should be about how best to support community councils in their role and not about whether they were or were not good. In complaints about the quality of community councils, the fault lay with the complainers.
- aa) The emphasis needed to be on outcomes, not on strategies and plans.
- bb) While there was no support for a centralisation of consultation responses by communities it was noted that it might be helpful if some centralised resource could be made available for the “digestion” of the many bulky consultation documents that community councils were invited to take part in. It would be much easier for community councils to focus on and comment on issues if this prior work could be done. This might be a function for the AOCC.
- cc) It was noted that in Moray there was no collective organisation and without the AOCC there was no Park voice. The AOCC was needed in this area.
- dd) In Annex 2 Paragraph 1(b), it was noted that the AOCC was aware of the need for geographic communities to take account of communities of interest.

12.. Summing up, the Convener noted that there was support for the overall framework for community engagement and support, with clear recognition of the primacy of the Community Planning Partnerships and the need to avoid any duplication of what was delivered through these. However, there was general recognition that even within this framework, there was a role for the AOCC provided there was a very clear delineation of the role that they could deliver which would be centred around those set out in Paragraph 22. It was also noted that any funding should be associated with a review of the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery by the AOCC. It was also noted that the proposed funding under Option 3 from the CNPA would be capable of being match funded by other sources, notably the Scottish Government Climate Change Fund. There seemed to be general agreement that Option 3 – a limited level of grant support for the AOCC – was the way forward and that the details should be approved through an expenditure justification to the Finance Committee. A further suggestion in this regard was made to the effect that a Memorandum of Understanding might be a sensible way of ensuring that the various groups (Chamber of Commerce, DMOs, AOCC etc) were being joined up with the AOCC activities. Businesses were a core part of the community, and as mentioned earlier it was essential that communities were seen in their wider sense not just as being community councils.

13. The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) Noted the overall framework for community engagement and support;
- b) Approved Option 3 as the basis for continued CNPA grant support to the Association of Cairngorms Communities (AOCC) tied to specific Park Plan deliverables and to them actively progressing the organisational improvement actions set out in their Business Plan. A review of the effectiveness of delivery should be built into the granting of support (with the timing of this review to be decided).
- c) Agreed to adopt the locally tailored version of the National Standards for Community Engagement to guide how the CNPA engages with communities. (As set out at Annex 2 but subject to some minor changes notably use of the word "will" to be changed to "should/could/may". And at 1(b) "all" to be redrafted as "those with and interest".

14. Action:

- a) Andrew Harper/Claire Ross to take a funding proposal in accordance with Option 3 to the Finance Committee for final approval of the deliverables, and the timing of the review.
- b) Andrew Harper/Claire Ross to amend the Annex 2 Standards for Community Engagement as set out above (Paragraph 13(c)).
- c) Andrew Harper/Claire Ross to explore the possibility of a Memorandum of Understanding to ensure the joined up working of various groups that could be considered as members of the community in its wider sense.

Cultural Heritage – Update on CNPA’s Work and Proposed Community Heritage Project (Paper 2)

15. Hamish Trench introduced the paper which fell into two parts; the first updated the Board on the recent and current work on cultural heritage being delivered through the National Park Plan; the second proposed a new Community Heritage Project as part of the CNPA’s role. Paragraphs 9 to 16 set out recent and current work in this area; the intention was that this work should continue. Discussions with stakeholders in the previous six months had considered how best the CNPA could add value and support the range of partners working on cultural heritage. The main conclusions from these discussions were threefold:

- a) A significant number of organisations and local groups were engaged in cultural heritage activity in the Park but a resource was needed to provide support and coordination and focus to make the most of this activity for the Park as a whole;
- b) There was relatively good coverage of policy and advice on the physical aspects of the historic environment through national bodies and statutory remits which would be supported at a Park-wide scale through the landscape framework;

- c) There was a gap in support and promotion for community heritage, such as social history, history of local places and particularly relatively recent heritage that was not addressed by national bodies but was key to local identity.

16. Following those discussions and conclusions, Paragraph 20 set out the proposed focus for the CNPA's role in cultural heritage over the next three years. While two of these were developments of work already engaged in, the third was new, and proposed the establishment of a community heritage project which would provide a project officer to take a pro-active approach to supporting communities to understand, conserve, enjoy, and promote aspects of their local community heritage. Further details of this project were set out at Paragraphs 22 to 29, and the Board was asked to agree to the establishment of this project. The total funding proposed would cover the costs of the Project Officer as well as some seed corn funding. The proposal was that some funding would be provided by the CNPA and that applications should also be made for funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund (Your Heritage Programme) and Cairngorms Leader. The total cost of the project proposed was £150,562 over three years, with the proposed contribution by CNPA being £47,000 over three years (starting April 2009) plus provision of office accommodation and management.

17. An outline of the project and the proposed CNPA expenditure was considered by the Finance Committee on the 8th August. The committee had approved the proposed spend in principle subject to maximising the available seed corn fund and minimising recruitment costs. The committee had also expressed the need to manage expectations over what one post would be able to achieve.

18. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) Coordination of the role of partners was an essential part of the CNPA's role in cultural heritage. The discussion with some national partners had been disappointing; in particular Historic Scotland's very limited focus to their core activity on listed buildings. In the same vein, Historic Scotland's reluctance to give advice on a recent planning case was also noted. Particularly on the issue of cultural heritage advice it was suggested that a memorandum of understanding or something similar with partners such as local authorities and Historic Scotland would be useful.
- b) There was clearly a gap in respect of public support and advice in respect of cultural heritage. There remained a question as to whether or not there was enough national funding for cultural heritage projects beyond those just limited to listed buildings. The question was asked as to whether the CNPA should be lobbying nationally to get more support for, and greater attention paid to, the other elements of cultural heritage.

- c) The proposed role of the Project Officer in networking communities and sharing good practice was welcomed. This was a good opportunity to effect coordination of interest across the Park; without that coordination of what already existed, the CNPA's own resources would be spread very thin. In this respect it was suggested that some more formalised grouping (separate from the current Advisory Forums) might be helpful. Part of the role of the Project Officer might well be to develop such a grouping/groupings.
- d) It was noted that the culture of today would be the heritage of tomorrow. The marked decline in the number of actively occupied farms within the Cairngorms was highlighted. It was noted that UHI had already indicated an interest in the cultural heritage associated with hill farms and crofts and in this respect it was also noted that the proposed project would have the focus on oral history, working with communities to ensure that stories about the past were not lost. The project would certainly be looking at the recent past as well as the distant past.
- e) The project was widely welcomed around the table. It was noted that such a project on cultural heritage would help develop the sense of cohesiveness of the Park, bringing communities together.
- f) The Year of Homecoming 2009 might provide some useful funding streams for this project.
- g) The role of the Grantown Museum, run by a voluntary organisation, rather than the public sector, was noted and commended.
- h) There existed a range of organisations across the Park running voluntary cultural heritage initiatives and it would be important to engage with these too as part of the project.
- i) Hopefully the project would encourage people to share information to create a pooled resource then available to everybody.
- j) Suggestion was made of a heritage "team" within the Park Authority, drawing together themes of winter sports, tartans etc. The project could usefully highlight a number of signature themes of the Park which would have economic potential.
- k) Various databases already existed in the public sector with vast ranges of photographs, information etc. It would be essential to plug into these national schemes, and ensure that databases were searchable on the basis of the Cairngorms National Park. The trick was to make best use of what was already there. Part of this might be ensuring that schools were signed up to the SCRAN (Scottish Cultural Resources Access Network) Project.
- l) A huge resource existed within local authorities. The Project Officer should be encouraged to work with the adult education sector as a way of tapping into this huge capacity in local communities. Local authorities in particular had large archive stores which were potentially hugely valuable to the areas cultural heritage.
- m) It was noted that the Dalwhinnie Community had just published a book about its own cultural heritage.

- n) The recent formation of the Ballater History Group, and its success, was noted. This also confirmed the huge resource that existed within communities in the Park and the challenge of being able to tap into this and coordinate on a Park-wide basis.
- o) It was pointed out that there were many structures and buildings in the Park not of architectural merit but which were of cultural heritage interest. It would be helpful if the emerging Local Plan could somehow provide for recognition and protection of these.
- p) Mechanisms were needed to ensure that material (photographs etc) were not lost.
- q) There was some concern about the readiness with which the seed corn funding would attract in the funding of partners.
- r) The real challenge of this project was keeping a limited effort and resource focused on the Aims of the Park, and making the best use of the limited resources. The discussion had illustrated that there was scope for many more than just the single post being proposed. It would be essential to be very clear about the project outputs as set out at Paragraph 28 and be able to measure the delivery of these as the project was monitored. It was also noted that in respect of funding from other partners, to some extent this had not worked well in the past because there had been an outstanding need for a person to coordinate this. Hopefully the creation of the Project Officer would help accordingly.

19. The Board agreed the recommendations of the papers as follows:

- a) Noted the recent and current work on cultural heritage being delivered through the National Park Plan;**
- b) Agreed the focus for the CNPA's role during the current Park Plan period including the establishment of a Community Heritage Project.**

20. Action:

- a) Hamish Trench to refine the points made in discussion into a number of themes to focus the work of the project.**

Programme of Board Meetings 2009 (Paper 3)

21. Andy Rinning introduced the paper seeking Members agreement to the schedule of Board meetings and Committee meetings for the calendar year 2009. These were agreed subject to the inclusion of provisional dates for Board meetings which might need to be rescheduled because of bad weather.

22. Action:

- a) Andy Rinning to circulate under separate cover to Members the revised list including provisional Board meeting dates as a contingency for bad weather.**

Core Paths Plan Update (Paper 4)

23. This was an information paper. Two observations were made:

- a) The work on a system for maintaining path condition was noted and the liaison with the FCS who were working on this as well was also noted.
- b) It was noted that the Board would be asked at the October Board meeting to approve any proposed changes to the Core Paths Plan as a result of objections made during the previous consultation. Members were urged to look at the proposed changes now, in advance of the October Board meeting, so that there were not surprises at that Board meeting. Any comments should be fed to Sandra Middleton in advance.

Supporting Sustainable Deer Management – an Update (Paper 5)

24. This paper was for information. There were no comments.

Cairngorms Local Biodiversity Action Plan Update (Paper 6)

25. This paper was for information. The only comment was that Perth and Kinross Council were currently not providing any funding for this project despite it covering their area. It was to be hoped that once the Perth and Kinross area were included in the Park this situation would be resolved.

Corporate Monitoring Framework (Paper 7)

26. This paper was for information. There were no comments.

AOCB

27. A number of brief items were reported as follows:

- a) The Convener had attended a Highland Council Ward Forum in Badenoch and Strathspey. These meetings now included a regular slot for National Parks. The next meeting of the Ward Forum would be the 8th October on the theme of education.
- b) The Convener reported on a recent event about an FCS initiative on woods in and around towns. This had a large amount of funding (around £24 million) being invested in it. However, there had been no mention of SEARS or National Parks, disappointingly.
- c) The recent visit by a group from Harris interested in the possibility of becoming a National Park had taken place recently. The Convener reported that the group very much appreciated the hospitality and information sharing from the Cairngorms National Park, and were positive about what was taking place in the Cairngorms National Park.

- d) As part of the consultation on the proposed extension to the southern boundary of the Park, being conducted by SNH, a number of open evenings were being held for consultees. The open events were being held in Blair Atholl, Glenshee, and Killiecrankie. The last of these, on the 8th October, still required a CNPA Board Member to attend.
- e) On the 30th September there was to be a meeting at the Lecht about education in the Park, involving a wide range of partners.
- f) The Convener noted that he was now a member of the Convention of Highlands and Islands on behalf of the Cairngorms National Park Authority. This meeting was chaired by the First Minister and was a good opportunity to network with other partners. The issues being discussed in the October meeting were crofting, housing, and spatial planning.
- g) The Deputy Convener noted a very interesting visit organised by the Planning Team to a wind farm at Farr.
- h) A number of Members reported attendance at various shows and games around the Park. It was noted in respect of the Lonach Gathering that people appeared to be showing a real sense of pride in being part of the National Park.
- i) Reference was made to the Aberdeenshire Local Plan, and it was noted that for the first time, the existence of an Aberdeenshire Local Plan and a National Park Local Plan side by side would mean that for the first time within a single local authority there would be different approaches within that local authority.
- j) Sandy Park announced to the Board that with regret he was handing in his resignation to the CNPA, giving three months notice. Recent changes within the Highland Council meant that it was increasingly difficult for him to wear two "hats" and to be able to give both jobs the attention they deserved. It was therefore right to step back. He noted he had thoroughly enjoyed his time on the Park Authority and would continue to ensure in his new position that the Highland Council worked closely with the Cairngorms National Park Authority. The Board noted his departure with regret, and wished him well.

Date of Next Meeting

28. Friday 31st October, Lonach Hall.