
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

held at The Community Hall, Boat of Garten
on Friday 11th June 2010 at 10.00am

PRESENT

Peter Argyle	Mary McCafferty
Stuart Black	Eleanor Mackintosh
Geva Blackett	Ian Mackintosh
Duncan Bryden	Anne MacLean
Jaci Douglas	Alastair MacLennan
Dave Fallows	Andrew Rafferty
Lucy Grant	Gregor Rimell
David Green	Richard Stroud
Drew Hendry	Susan Walker
Bob Kinnaird	

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mary Grier	Pip Mackie
Don McKee	Julie Millman

APOLOGIES:

Eric Baird	Willie McKenna
Marcus Humphrey	Fiona Murdoch

AGENDA ITEMS 1 & 2:

WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

1. The Convenor welcomed all present.
2. Apologies were received from the above Members.
3. It was noted that Willie McKenna had given apologies for the meeting. This was due to him being an employee of Rothiemurchus Estate, as he would have had to declare an interest in Item No. 6 (Paper 1) on the Agenda and therefore withdraw from the main discussion.

AGENDA ITEM 3:

MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

4. The minutes of the previous meeting, 28th May 2010, held at The Cairngorm Hotel, Aviemore were approved:
 - With an amendment to Paragraph 47d – to state concern that the precedent could potentially extend into mechanisms for securing Affordable Housing.

- The inclusion of a Paragraph after No. 53 ‘Members also raised strong concerns regarding the number of retrospective applications which had recently been submitted in the Park area. Sue Walker suggested that an article in the press stating the importance of applying for planning permission prior to carrying out any development would help raise the prominence of the issue in a public forum.’
5. There were no matters arising.

**AGENDA ITEM 4:
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS ON ANY ITEMS APPEARING
ON THE AGENDA**

6. Andrew Rafferty declared a direct interest in Planning Application No. 10/158/CP, due to the Applicant being the landlord of his business premises at Dalfaber.
7. Mary McCafferty declared a direct interest in Planning Application No. 10/166/CP, due to her being the Applicant.
8. Dave Fallows declared a direct interest in Planning Application No. 10/178/CP, due to him advising the tenant on Building Control issues.
9. Jaci Douglas declared an indirect interest in Item No. 6 (Paper 1) on the Agenda, due to her being a friend of Piers Voysey, one of the Applicants advisors.
10. David Green declared an indirect interest in Item No. 6 (Paper 1) on the Agenda, due to his Brother in Law being director of a company that had previously carried out work on the application.

**AGENDA ITEM 5:
PLANNING APPLICATION CALL-IN DECISIONS
(Oral Presentation, Mary Grier)**

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11. 10/156/CP - | No Call-in |
| 12. 10/157/CP - | No Call-in |
| 13. 10/158/CP - | Andrew Rafferty declared a direct interest and left the room.
No Call-in
Andrew Rafferty returned. |
| 14. 10/159/CP - | No Call-in |
| 15. 10/160/CP - | No Call-in |
| 16. 10/161/CP - | No Call-in |
| 17. 10/162/CP - | No Call-in |
| 18. 10/163/CP - | No Call-in |
| 19. 10/164/CP - | No Call-in |
| 20. 10/165/CP - | No Call-in |
| 21. 10/166/CP - | Mary McCafferty declared a direct interest and left the room.
No Call-in
Mary McCafferty returned. |
| 22. 10/167/CP - | No Call-in |
| 23. 10/168/CP - | No Call-in |
| 24. 10/169/CP - | No Call-in |

- 25. 10/170/CP - No Call-in
- 26. 10/171/CP - No Call-in
- 27. 10/172/CP - No Call-in
- 28. 10/173/CP - No Call-in
- 29. 10/174/CP - No Call-in
- 30. 10/175/CP - No Call-in
- 31. 10/176/CP - No Call-in
- 32. 10/177/CP - No Call-in

Dave Fallows declared a direct interest and left the room.

- 33. 10/178/CP - No Call-in
Dave fallows returned.

COMMENTING ON APPLICATIONS NOT CALLED-IN BY THE COMMITTEE

- 34. The Members wished to make comments to the Local Authorities on the following Planning Application No's 10/156/CP, 10/159/CP, 10/161/CP, 10/163/CP, 10/164/CP, 10/165/CP, 10/169/CP, 10/170/CP, 10/171/CP & 10/177/CP. The planning officers noted these comments and were delegated with the responsibility of whether or not to submit the comments to the Local Authorities.

**AGENDA ITEM 6:
REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF NEW COMMUNITY (UP TO 1500 HOUSES; ASSOCIATED BUSINESS,
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE)
AT AN CAMAS MÓR, AVIEMORE
(PAPER 1) (09/155/CP)**

35. Jaci Douglas and David Green declared an indirect interest but did not leave the room.
36. Duncan Bryden informed Members that Representatives for the Applicant (An Camas Mor LLP) wished to address the Committee / be available for questions – they were:
- Johnnie Grant,
 - Howard Brindley, Agent
 - Mark Turnbull, regarding the Environmental Statement for the Application
 - David Sim, Masterplan Architect
 - Andy MacKenzie, Ecological Advisor
 - Ben Tindall, Architect
 - John Hamilton (Rettie & Co), regarding infrastructure issues
37. Duncan Bryden informed Members that several requests from other parties had been made to address the Committee – they were:
- John Davison, Representee
 - John Berkeley, Representee
 - Mary Clark, Chair of Boat of Garten Community Council
 - Dr Gus Jones, Convener of Badenoch & Strathspey Conservation Group
 - John Grierson, Chair of Aviemore & Vicinity Community Council
 - Jane Horsburgh, Policy Officer from Guide Dogs for the Blind
38. The Committee agreed to the requests.
39. Duncan Bryden advised Members that due to the significance of the application, it was proposed to set aside the time limits for the Applicants and Other Parties to address the Committee. A time limit of 15 – 20 minutes (in total) would be allocated. The time would be monitored, with both parties having an equal time to address the Committee.
40. Duncan Bryden informed Members that Don McKee, CNPA Head of Development Management would be presenting the report and in attendance were Pip Mackie taking minutes, assisted by Julie Millman and from CNPA's Strategic Land Use Group – Matthew Hawkins (Senior Heritage Officer), Frances Thin (Landscape Advisor) & Karen Couper (Ecology Advisor) and from CNPA Sustainable Rural Development Group – Murray Ferguson (Sustainable Rural Development Director and also responsible for the CNPA Visitor Services and Recreation Group) who would address the committee if required.
- There were also Representatives from:
- Les Houliker, The Highland Council TEC Services
 - Keith Duncan, SNH Area Officer
41. Duncan Bryden advised that 9 letters of Representation had been received after the report had been issued but within the given timescale of 48 hours prior to the meeting. These letters were circulated to Members at the start of the meeting. He also advised

that 2 letters of Representation had been received outwith the 48 hour timescale prior to the meeting. These letters had not been circulated.

42. The Committee paused to read the 9 letters which had been received within the given timescale.
43. Don McKee presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to a Section 75 Legal Agreement and conditions as stated in the report. He advised Members that when the report was issued there was still an outstanding consultation response from Transport Scotland, this had now been received. Due to the information contained within the response, he was advising an amendment to Part A of the report recommendation to remove the 10th Bullet Point - Trunk Roads contribution as required by Transport Scotland. He pointed out that it was necessary to include a requirement for a contribution to the Highland Council for improvements to Grampian Road. Don McKee also advised the inclusion of a periodic review being undertaken of the off-site compensatory habitats and that success being linked to development proceeding
44. Don McKee took Members through a presentation including photographs of the site from various elevated locations, photographs in and around the site, and a range of the supporting information that accompanied the application. He drew Members' attention to the policy context as set out in the report, particularly the adopted Principles for An Camas Mòr that were now in the Cairngorms National Park Local Plan Post Inquiry Modifications, the various consultation responses, and the number and content of representations. He explained that in reaching his recommendation he had assessed the application against each of the Principles, as far as is possible at this level of detail, compliance with the 4 aims of the National Park (including the issue of any conflict between the 1st and the other aims) and fit with National, Local and National Park policy. He pointed out to Members that the application was for the principle only. The next stage would be an application for a full Masterplan and if that were approved there would be subsequent applications over time for the detailed roll out of development. At each stage the applications would have to be assessed against the adopted Principles, the National Park aims, and the development plan to ensure a consistent and robust appraisal and delivery to a high standard fit for a National Park throughout the period of development.
45. The Committee were invited to question Don McKee on points of clarification relating to his report, the following were raised:
 - a) The consultation response from Transport Scotland and the potential for increased pressure on the Trunk Roads network. Don McKee responded that he had asked Transport Scotland to confirm that they had no objections and did not require a contribution for A9(T) junction improvements. He had been informed that, based on the Transport Assessment and subsequent information provided by the Applicant, this was indeed the Transport Scotland position.
 - b) Increase in demand for the Fire Service. Point 64 in report refers.
 - c) The landscape impact of the proposed new access road for Inverdrue. Don McKee acknowledged that this would need to be looked at as it crossed the open farmland and River Drue flood plain but the detail was not available at this stage.
 - d) Timing of the construction of the new Inverdrue road and residents' habitual use of the B970 if the new road is not available from the outset.
 - e) The first 200 houses being accessed from the B970.

- f) The need for the bridge linking An Camas Mor (ACM) with Aviemore to be constructed and how can it happen in partnership. Don McKee confirmed that Aviemore & Vicinity Community Council wished to lead on the Park project and bridge and suggested Members could ask questions on this to Mr. Grierson when he made his presentation. The Applicant had stated that there would be a financial contribution and involvement in the partnership. If there was not significant progress at the Masterplan stage then there would be an opportunity to reassess matters.
 - g) The need to assess all sewage and drainage systems are fully working at each of the review points during the development.
 - h) How achievable the landscaping / natural heritage issues will be in meeting the review points.
 - i) The level of Affordable Housing associated with the development and why this was not specified in the application. Don McKee explained that the length of the build period meant that there would have to be compliance with prevailing development plan policy on this issue throughout that time, but the Applicant's intention was that of the first 200 residential units 75% would be affordable. Highland Housing Alliance are proposing to enter into a Joint Venture Agreement with An Camas Mòr LLP for delivery of this housing, The relevance of the document referred to in Appendix 3 regarding forest habitat networks in Edinburgh and the Lothians.
 - j) The pedestrian / cycle links from ACM to Aviemore and clarification if any consideration had been given to using a ski chairlift type arrangement as an alternative means to cross the River Spey, as used in other Alpine communities.
46. Johnnie Grant, representing the Applicant, addressed the Committee. David Sim, architect for the Applicant, gave a power point presentation explaining the rationale behind the application and the commitment to deliver a high quality sustainable development.
47. The Committee were invited to ask questions of the two speakers, who were joined by the rest of the Applicants team, and the following points were raised:
- a) The number of houses being proposed in the development, particularly regarding the landscape and ecological consultation responses received.
 - b) Community space and how it was to be distributed throughout the site.
 - c) Snow clearing measures.
 - d) Confirmation that the Masterplan can deliver results 'on the ground'.
 - e) Construction of the new Inverdrue Road and the potential for it to be used for residential traffic from the outset of occupation of the houses.
 - f) The need for careful balancing between housing and ecology.
 - g) The achievability of the proposed off-site compensatory measures.
 - h) The high number of cars that can become associated with residential developments.
 - i) Tree distribution throughout the site.
 - j) Clarification of how the development would promote social interaction between residents and the local community.
 - k) Concern regarding shared surfaces and the need for them to be properly implemented.
48. John Grierson, Chair of Aviemore and Vicinity Community Council (AVCC), addressed the Committee expressing support for An Camas Mòr, agreeing that the Coylumbridge realignment was not needed, but AVCC would like development to start from the western end of the site, closest to Aviemore, and proceed eastwards. He explained about the AVCC led project for a Countryside Park with a pedestrian/cycle bridge

spanning the River Spey which they hoped could be in place by end of 2011. He expressed concern at the reference attributed to the CNPA Visitor Services and Recreation Group (VSRG) in the report which he took to be questioning the ability of community groups to deliver projects such as this.

49. The Committee were invited to ask questions of the speaker and the following points were raised:
 - a) The timescale for the Bridge and path project linking the Aviemore side of the proposed Countryside Park to ACM.
 - b) The timescale for applying for planning permission for the proposed bridge and path.
 - c) The ability of community groups to take forward local projects.
50. Duncan Bryden asked Murray Ferguson, CNPA Sustainable Rural Development Director, to respond to the comments regarding VSRG's observations in the planning report. Murray Ferguson made it clear that the VSRG were not questioning the ability of communities, but simply pointing out that there could be difficulties in this instance because the Applicant cannot control delivery of the bridge, there will also be possible ongoing maintenance issues, funding is only currently available for a feasibility study and the community do not own the land either side of the river.
51. Mary Clark, Chair of Boat of Garten Community Council, addressed the Committee and made various comments on the suitability of the B970 to take the traffic generated toward and through Boat of Garten as a result of this development.
52. Jane Horsburgh, Policy Officer of Guide Dogs for the Blind, addressed the Committee on the need for the developer to seek expert advice on how blind and partially sighted people can be assured of full access opportunities, particularly with regard to shared surfaces where there is potential for the creation of difficulties.
53. John Davison, Representee, had requested to address the Committee. The Committee were advised he was not present at the meeting.
54. John Berkeley, Representee, addressed the Committee and circulated a photograph showing the difficulties for 2 vehicles to pass safely on the B970 and drew attention to its use for walkers and cyclists.
55. Dr Gus Jones, Convenor of the Badenoch & Strathspey Conservation Group, addressed the Committee and gave a power point presentation addressing the impact of the development on species and habitats, conflict with the 1st aim of the National Park and on strategic need.
56. The Committee were invited to ask questions of the speakers and the following points were raised:
 - a) The need for any public bus service to be fully accessible for users of all abilities.
 - b) The proposed compensatory mitigation measures.
 - c) The discovery of unrecorded and LBAP priority species on the ACM site.
 - d) The previous use of the land for lowland grazing and the relatively short period of time in which it has regenerated.
57. Duncan Bryden thanked all the speakers.
58. The Committee were invited to ask questions of clarification from Les Houliker, the Highland Council TEC Services representative and the following point was raised:
 - a) The proposed access roads to the development including the timing of the new access from Inverdrue and impact on the B970 north of the site. Les Houliker drew attention to the fact that the development would have to comply with Highland Council guidelines and the provision of the new road from Inverdrue after 200 residential units would accord with this. He also accepted that the road to the north

was rural in character and although the Transport Assessment did not identify need for specific works it was something that could be looked at.

59. The Committee were invited to ask questions of clarification from Keith Duncan, SNH Area Officer and the following points were raised:

- a) Landscape and ecological designations covering the ACM site and the wider Rothiemurchus Estate area.
- b) Clarification of the potential negative impact on European protected species located in the vicinity of the site.

|

60. The Committee paused for lunch at 2:00pm.
61. The Committee reconvened at 2:45pm.
62. Duncan Bryden informed Members that it was within Committee Standing Orders to allow the Applicant and Other Parties to ask questions of each other at his discretion. He advised that in this instance questions or comments would be limited to 2 each.
63. Dr Gus Jones, Representative of the Badenoch & Strathspey Conservation Group, was invited to ask questions of Dr Andy MacKenzie, the Applicants' Ecological Advisor. The following two questions were asked:
 - a) Could clarification be given of recent examples of arable land regenerating to lowland heathland and their relevance to this application?
 - b) Could clarification be given regarding the biodiversity issues encountered on the site?
64. Dr Andy MacKenzie, the Applicants' Ecological Advisor was invited to ask questions of Dr Gus Jones, Representative of Badenoch & Strathspey Conservation Group. He chose to make comments on the following two issues :
 - a) The definition of Rodwell's National Vegetation Classification for Lowland Heath, as referred to in Dr Jones' presentation.
 - b) On the level and quality of information Dr Jones had provided to the Committee regarding the biodiversity conditions on the site and the willingness the Applicant had shown in having a range of ecological specialists working to establish the biodiversity status of the site.
65. Duncan Bryden thanked the two speakers.
66. The Committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:
 - a) Clarification of what is involved in the proposal regarding the B970 re-alignment.
 - b) The level of housing which could be accessed using the existing B970 junction before the new Inverdrue Road was in place.
 - c) Members wanted to know what exactly they would be agreeing to in accepting the principle of ACM as set down in the report. Don McKee explained that if they went by the recommendation it was simply for development of up to 1100 residential units, All of the more detailed levels of information would be included in the subsequent Masterplan application, should this application be approved, and thereafter in a series of detailed applications for phases of development over the years. In agreeing to the principle of development at ACM Members would still be able to assess each subsequent application in terms of compliance with that principle and also with the 11 Principles for An Camas Mòr and the 4 aims of the Park at each stage.
 - d) Speed limits through residential areas.
 - e) An anomaly between Transport Scotland's DDA Code of Practice Guide and Designing Streets.
 - f) The need for solutions to be investigated regarding shared surfaces and consultations undertaken with a qualified All Ability Access Specialist.
 - g) The need for public transport to be fully accessible.
 - h) The potential for future development to be made on an ad hoc basis, should the level of housing on the site be limited to 1100 residential units, as recommended in the report, and it subsequently became apparent that more could be accommodated..
 - i) The width of the woodlands on the site being specified in the recommended conditions and whether these are too large, too rigid and would have issues for safety of residents..

- j) The construction of the link Bridge being outwith the control of the Applicant and the need for the two developments to be achieved in tandem.
- k) Site HI in Kingussie was approved with up to 300 houses. Members therefore asked about the potential to approve the application 'up to 1500 residential units' with review points at specified construction levels.
- l) The assessment of the application against the Aims of the CNPA. Members sought clarification on the aims of the National Park and the role of the 1st aim. Don McKee directed Members to his report and pointed out that, based on the Environmental Impact Assessment carried out for the applicant, 1500 residential units on the site were assessed as having a substantial adverse landscape impact for a long period of time. It was considered by CNPA that this created a conflict with the 1st aim, but reducing the number to 1100 would reduce the impact and resolve the conflict.
- m) The construction of the new Inverdrue Road and the potential for it to be constructed to adoptable standards and then used for residential traffic from the outset.
- n) The difficulty in judging the potential increased traffic levels on the B970, particularly northbound.
- o) The pedestrian / cycle safety implications associated with increased traffic flow on the B970.
- p) The possibility of making the new Inverdrue Road the only access road to the ACM site, with access for emergency vehicles by other means.

67. The Committee asked questions of clarification from Les Houlker, the Highland Council TEC Services and the following points were raised:

- a) The submitted Traffic Impact Assessment.
- b) The acceptability of a large scale development having only one means of access road.
- c) The level of traffic that would use the new Inverdrue Road.
- d) The need for improvement works to be undertaken on the B970 north of the site.
- e) The number of houses accessed from the Dalfaber junction in Aviemore.

68. Gregor Rimell proposed a Motion for the wording in Condition 2 to be amended to ‘...up to 1500 houses’ as the application was for Outline Planning Permission it was too early to be prescriptive. This was seconded by Dave Fallows.
69. Don McKee pointed out to Members that 1500 residential units had been assessed by the Applicant and CNPA Landscape Officers as having a substantial adverse impact for a long period of time. A Member asked Don McKee if up to 1500 was accepted now would Members have an opportunity to consider the number and the impact again at the full Masterplan stage. Don McKee stated that they would and the Member expressed satisfaction that agreeing up to 1500 would then be appropriate.
70. Susan Walker proposed an Amendment to retain Condition 2 for ‘...up to 1100 residential units’ as per the report. This was seconded by Lucy Grant.
71. The vote was as follows:

	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Peter Argyle	√		
Stuart Black		√	
Geva Blackett	√		
Duncan Bryden		√	
Jaci Douglas	√		
Dave Fallows	√		
Lucy Grant		√	
David Green		√	
Drew Hendry	√		
Bob Kinnaird	√		
Mary McCafferty	√		
Eleanor Mackintosh		√	
Ian Mackintosh	√		
Anne MacLean		√	
Alastair MacLennan	√		
Andrew Rafferty		√	
Gregor Rimell	√		
Richard Stroud		√	
Susan Walker		√	
TOTAL	10	9	0

72. The Committee agreed for the wording in Condition 2 to be amended to ‘...up to 1500 residential units’.
73. Stuart Black proposed a Motion that the new Inverdrue Road should be brought up to adoptable standard and used from the start of the occupancy of the houses. This was seconded by Anne MacLean.
74. Dave Fallows proposed an Amendment that the B970 be used up to a level of 200 residential units being developed and thereafter the new Inverdrue Road should be used to access the site – as per the recommendation in the report. This was seconded by Peter Argyle.
75. The vote was as follows:

	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Peter Argyle		√	
Stuart Black	√		
Geva Blackett	√		
Duncan Bryden		√	
Jaci Douglas	√		
Dave Fallows		√	
Lucy Grant	√		
David Green		√	
Drew Hendry		√	
Bob Kinnaird		√	
Mary McCafferty		√	
Eleanor Mackintosh		√	
Ian Mackintosh		√	
Anne MacLean	√		
Alastair MacLennan	√		
Andrew Rafferty	√		
Gregor Rimell		√	
Richard Stroud	√		
Susan Walker	√		
TOTAL	9	10	0

76. The Committee agreed that the B970 be used up to a level of 200 residential units being developed and thereafter the new Inverdrurie Road should be used to access the site – as per the recommendation in the report.
77. Clarification was sought from the Planning Officials as to whether or not a vote could be taken on the blocking of the access road joining the B970 for general vehicular use (emergency vehicle access only allowed) once the 200 residential units had been constructed.
78. Don McKee advised that the access being blocked off to the B970 from ACM may have implications for Highland Council contributing funding to the new Inverdrurie road and he pointed out that Les Houlker has been unable to say definitely if this was possible anyway under the Highland Council guidelines for roads. It was then agreed that no vote would be taken on this issue.
79. Duncan Bryden then took Members through the section of the report dealing with the 11 Principles for An Camas Mòr and the 4 aims of the National Park. He asked Members if they were satisfied with the proposal under each Principle and Aim. Members indicated that they were content.
80. The Committee agreed to approve the application on the basis that, judged by the information presented, they had confidence that it broadly satisfied the Principles for An Camas Mòr and did not conflict with the National Park aims and on the understanding that the formal Masterplan will have to provide substantially more detail to demonstrate comprehensive compliance with the Principles and complete accord with the aims. For the avoidance of doubt the application will be subject to a Section 75 Legal Agreement on the basis set out in the report with the following amendments:

- a) The removal of the 10th Bullet Point - Trunk Roads contribution as required by Transport Scotland and inclusion of a bullet point for contribution to Grampian Road improvements.
 - b) The inclusion of an 'accessible' public bus service in the Green Transport plan.
 - c) The inclusion of the off-site compensatory habitats to be monitored at the development review points.
 - d) The development review points to include monitoring the impact on the road network in the vicinity of the site.
81. And the conditions as stated in the report were agreed with the following amendments:
- a) Condition 2 – ‘...permission is for up to 1500 residential units.’
 - b) Condition 3 – Bullet Point 3 – Rephrase to include ‘Detailed phasing proposals and provisions for regular review, with options to pursue actions should they be required, in terms of the timing status and impact of development and progress on the measures undertaken at the off-site compensatory habitat areas.’
 - c) Condition 3 – Bullet Point 5 – to read: ‘The contribution of An Camas Mòr in terms of both finance and active involvement in the community led partnership to facilitate delivery of a direct foot/cycle path link to central Aviemore via a bridge over the River Spey in tandem with the initial phase of development.’
 - d) Condition 3 – Bullet Point 12 – ‘...in consultation with a qualified Access Consultant.’
 - e) Condition 3 – Bullet Point 16 – to include provision for waste water treatment to agreed standards at each phase of development.
 - f) Condition 3 – Bullet 21 – ‘...to include reference to a district heating system and carbon reduction.’
 - g) Condition 4 – Bullet Points 8, 11 & 12 – to include: ‘...the Applicants to demonstrate that woodland cover on and around the site...’
 - h) Condition 6 – Replace ‘fully adoptable standard’ with ‘to the satisfaction of CNPA in consultation with Highland Council TEC Services.’
 - i) Condition 7 – Add that in addition a review of all site access road arrangements shall be undertaken once the development level of 200 residential units has been reached.

**AGENDA ITEM 7:
ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

82. There was no other business.

**AGENDA ITEM 8:
DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

83. Friday 25th June 2010 at 10:30am in The Albert Hall, Ballater.

84. Committee Members are requested to ensure that any Apologies for this meeting are submitted to the Planning Office in Ballater.

85. The meeting concluded at 4:40pm.