



## Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting

Held at Cairngorms National Park Authority HQ, Grantown on Spey

Hybrid

26 April 2024 at 10.00am

### Present

Chris Beattie (Planning Convener)  
Eleanor Mackintosh (Deputy Planning Convener)  
Dr Peter Cosgrove  
Russell Jones  
Bill Lobban  
Lauren MacCallum  
Derek Ross

Sandy Bremner  
Kenny Deans  
John Kirk  
Steve Micklewright  
Duncan Miller

### Virtual

Geva Blackett  
Xander McDade  
Ann Ross

Paul Gibb  
Dr Fiona McLean

### Apologies

Dr Hannah Girst.

### In Attendance

Gavin Miles, Head of Strategic Planning  
Peter Ferguson, Harper MacLeod LLP  
Emma Bryce, Planning Manager (Development Manager)  
Katie Crerar, Planning Officer (Development Management)  
Katherine Donnachie, Planning Officer (Development Management)  
Emma Greenlees, Planning Support Officer  
Alix Harkness, Clerk to the Board  
Karen Johnstone, Clerk to the Board



## **Agenda Item 1 and 2**

### **Welcome and Apologies**

1. The Planning Convener welcomed all present including members of the public. Apologies were noted.

## **Agenda Item 3**

### **Declarations of Interest**

2. John Kirk declared an interest in Item 6. His wife has a house near the caravan park and he has done work for them over the years. He advised he would leave the meeting for the duration of this item.

## **Agenda Item 4**

### **Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising**

3. The minutes of the previous meeting on 8 March 2024 held at Cairngorms National Park Authority, Grantown on Spey, were approved with no amendments.

## **Agenda Item 5**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2023/0245/DET (23/02451/FUL)**

Formation of touring motorhome / caravan site at Land 85M North of Birchview, Dalwhinnie

Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions

4. Katherine Donnachie, Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.
5. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer for clarity, and the following points were raised:
  - a) Clarification sought that there was no proposal to provide an electric vehicle (EV) charging points. It was confirmed that this had been discussed with the applicant who proposed that the EV charging points available at the nearby Loch Erricht hotel) also owned by the applicant) could be used by vehicles from the proposed development. The Planning Officer suggested an informative be added to any



permission recommending that the applicant installs EV charging facilities on the site.

- b) A member sought reassurance that the proposed access route to and from the site would be safe. Planning Officer advised that while access and egress was close to a petrol filling station, the council's trading standards team as the Petroleum Enforcement Authority were satisfied that appropriate safety measures were being met. Gavin Miles, Head of Strategic Planning added that the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) and Council's Environmental Health team had been consulted and were also satisfied with the arrangements proposed.
- c) Would the site be fenced to prevent any dogs accessing the fields to the north whether could be livestock or wading birds nesting? It was confirmed that the site would have stock fencing on those boundaries.

6. The agent John Craig addressed the committee.

7. The Committee were invited to ask for clarity. The following point was raised:

- a) Clarification was sought about why there were no EV charging points proposed on the site. Mr Craig advised that the cost of providing the facilities on the site was prohibitive at this point in time but noted that the applicant would encourage anyone who needed to use the existing EV charging point at the Loch Erricht hotel which was also in their ownership.

8. The objectors Anja Armstrong and Eileen Feilen presented to the committee.

9. The Committee were invited to ask for clarity. The following points were raised:

- a) Clarity sought on whether the objectors wanted the proposed development to be refused or simply reduced in size and scale. The objectors confirmed that they would prefer the application to be refused and relocated to a different site in Dalwhinnie.
- b) A member asked why it was their opinion that the proposed development would prevent the remaining part of the housing allocation from being developed. Ms Armstrong explained that in their opinion it would not be possible to access the remainder of the site because vehicles could not turn on the track.
- c) Could it be confirmed who owns the track down to Birchview? Ms Armstrong reported that it they had not been able to trace the owner, it was unadopted and covered in potholes with no room for construction vehicles to turn.



10. The Committee were invited to ask for clarity from the Planning team. The following points were raised:
  - a) Head of Strategic Planning advised that part of the housing site allocated in the Local Development Plan that overlapped the proposed development was immediately adjacent to the petrol station. He noted that Dalwhinnie was not a location where developers seemed likely to want to undertake speculative development of numbers of units so it was more likely that any housing development would be undertaken by individuals buying parcels of land and building themselves.
  - b) Head of Strategic Planning advised that if the application was approved and the development undertaken, there would still be space on the remainder of the allocated housing site for a number of units that would be dictated by their size.
  - c) The Planning Officer confirmed that contrary to a statement made by the agent, the woodland on the site was not identified in the ancient woodland inventory but was open birch woodland.
  - d) The Planning officer confirmed that the technical consultees were satisfied with the proposed drainage and that the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and appropriate part of Highland Council were satisfied with the proposed vehicle access arrangements.
  
11. The Committee were invited to discuss the report. The following points were raised:
  - a) It was noted that the loss of part of an identified housing site was a negative but that but that the economic development contribution of the proposal would be positive for Dalwhinnie.
  - b) Clarification sought that no fixed static caravans or cabins were proposed, only stances for touring caravans and motorhomes. Planning Officer confirmed that this was the case.
  - c) A member asked if it would be a simple process to return the site to its original state should the owner want to. Planning Officer confirmed that this would be the case.
  - d) Comment made that this was a good use of land for a rural village in need of the uplift that this development could bring them.
  
12. The Committee approved the application as per the officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions detailed in the report.
  
13. Action Point arising: None



John Kirk left the room, at 11.05 am

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2023/0380/DET (23/03948/FUL)**

Extension to caravan site with 16No. static holiday caravans at Granttown on Spey Caravan and Motorhome Club, Seafield Avenue, Granttown on Spey, PH26 3JQ

**Recommendation:** Approve subject to conditions

14. Katie Crerar, Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.
15. The Committee were invited to ask for clarity, and the following points were raised:
  - a) A member commented that the static caravans would be fixed and could be lived in all year round. Head of Strategic Planning advised that permanent occupation of the static caravans could be prohibited.
  - b) It was noted that this was a retrospective planning application and that development had taken place previously without permission on the same site. Head of Strategic Planning reminded the Committee that the fact that the application was retrospective was not relevant to their decision. He acknowledged that retrospective applications were frustrating the public and for staff and members, noting that the current application only covered part of the unauthorised works that had taken on the site.
  - c) Head of Strategic Planning explained that the applicant would have to work hard to discharge the condition requiring biodiversity enhancements and that the extension to the site would not be permitted to operate until the condition had been discharged.
  - d) Suggestion made by the Planning Committee Deputy Convener that the Planning Committee Convener write to the applicant to convey the Committee's frustration and anger that the application was retrospective. They also proposed that the committee give the planning team authority to issue stop notices via the convener and deputy convener rather than seeking approval of the entire committee.
16. The objector Tessa Jones on behalf of Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group addressed the committee.
17. The Head of Strategic Planning advised members that a number of points made by the objector were not directly relevant to the development proposed, but rather the



Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group's concerns about the management of other land nearby that was not connected to the proposed development or controlled by the applicant.

18. The Committee were invited to discuss the report. The following points were raised:
- a) There was unanimous frustration and anger at the retrospective nature of the application and support for the Convener writing to campsite owners to explain the Committee's concerns at the retrospective applications and delegation of authority to the planning team to enforce without coming back to the Committee.
  - b) A member raised concern around the environmental impact on biodiversity that they considered the development would have on its environs should it be approved.
  - c) A member asked what would happen if the Committee refused the application – would the applicant then have to reinstate the ground? Head of Strategic Planning advised that the applicant would be likely to appeal a refusal and in this case he considered it likely that an appeal would be successful, leading to permission being granted. Concern raised that the caravans could become permanent homes. In the past, as part of planning conditions, the Committee have asked caravan sites to keep a register who is in the caravans dictating that they can only be lived in so many months during the course of a year and the rest of the time uninhabited. Head of Strategic Planning advised that they are not intended to be inhabited all year round and confirmed that a condition could be added to limit the number of days per year the caravan can be occupied for by the same people and limiting the duration if any single stay as well as requiring a register to be kept.
  - d) Question around the implications for waste disposal and were any mitigation proposed. Planning Officer advised that the infrastructure for waste disposal was already on site and connected to the existing caravan park. She added that there was no wider impact as a result of this.
  - e) Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that officer would add a condition prohibiting the use of the static caravans as permanent residencies and prohibit both number of days in a year an individual could stay in them as well as the duration of any periods use and requiring the provision of a register.
  - f) A member sought assurance from Peter Ferguson, Harper McLeod LLP that the conditions imposed would be adhered to. Peter Ferguson advised that the condition is enforceable and can be readily used.



19. Derek Ross noted his view that the application should be refused and Bill Lobban noted that he would second an amendment for refusal.
20. The Convener adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes to allow the preparation of amendments to the motion created by the Officer's recommendation.
21. The meeting recommenced at 12:00pm.
22. The Convener reminded members of the motion to approve the application as per the officer recommendation in the planning paper with the additional condition limiting occupation.
23. It was noted that Steve Micklewright left the room for part of the discussion on this item so could not take part in the vote on the item.
24. Derek Ross put forward an amendment to refuse the application, on the basis that if granted, the development would have a detrimental effect on the natural environment, due to negative effects on biodiversity and lead to unacceptable pressure on the surrounding area, contrary to National Planning Framework 4: Policy 3 Natural Heritage. This was seconded by Bill Lobban.



25. The Committee proceeded into a vote. The results were as follows:

	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Chris Beattie	√		
Geva Blackett	√		
Sandy Bremner	√		
Peter Cosgrove	√		
Kenny Deans		√	
Paul Gibb		√	
Russell Jones		√	
Bill Lobban		√	
Lauren MacCallum	√		
Eleanor Mackintosh	√		
Xander McDade	√		
Fiona McLean			√
Duncan Miller		√	
Ann Ross	√		
Derek Ross		√	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>

26. The Committee approved the application subject to the conditions stated in the report and an additional condition to prevent caravans becoming permanent homes.

27. Action Points arising:

- i. **Authority delegated to officers to take enforcement action to prevent further unauthorised development of the site if required.**
- ii. **Planning Committee Convener to write to the applicant to convey the committee's significant disappointment at the retrospective nature of the application.**





## **Agenda Item 7**

### **For Information**

EIA Screening determination in relation to application 2023/0004/DET

Change of use of land for siting of 25 lodges, access road and landscaping at Site of Dry Ski Slope, Grampian Road, Aviemore

28. Gavin Milles, Head of Strategic Planning presented the paper to the committee.

29. The Committee noted the paper.

30. Action Point arising: None

## **Agenda Item 8**

### **For Information**

Scottish Government Planning System Consultations

Introduced by: Gavin Miles, Head of Strategic Planning

31. Gavin Milles, Head of Strategic Planning presented the paper to the committee.

32. The Committee noted the paper.

33. Action Point arising: None

## **AOCB**

34. Reassurance was sought as to how the staff would report the enforcement progress to the committee going forward given that they had been delegated the authority to take action. Head of Strategic Planning advised that in the limited instances where this would be relevant, the notices would be confirmed via the convener and vice convener. The committee would be notified in the normal way with formal updates at Planning Committee meetings, either in public or confidential sessions depending on the nature of the update.

35. A member noted that in their local authority, committee members were required to attend any site visits in order to participate in the determination of applications. The different practice of different local authority standing orders for planning committee business was noted.



36. The Committee Convener raised a motion to move to a confidential session.

37. The public business of the meeting concluded at 12.16 pm

38. Date of next meeting 14 June 2024.



## Minutes of the Resource Committee Meeting

Held at Cairngorms National Park Authority and Virtually

17 May 2024 at 02.30pm

### Present

Russell Jones (Chair)	Sandy Bremner (Board Convener)
Dr Fiona McLean (substitute for Dr Hannah Grist)	Lauren McCallum (Deputy Chair)
Xander McDade	Derek Ross

### In Attendance

Grant Moir, CEO  
David Cameron, Director of Corporate Services and Deputy CEO  
Kate Christie, Head of Organisational Development  
Louise Allen, Head of Finance and Corporate Operations  
Karen Johnstone, Clerk to the Board

### Apologies

Dr Hannah Grist

### Minutes from the previous meeting for approval

1. The minutes from the meeting on the 26 January 2024 were approved with no amendments.

### Matters arising not covered from previous meeting

2. None

### Declarations of interest

3. No declarations of interest were made.



## **Budget Monitoring**

4. Louise Allen, Head of Finance and Corporate Operations, presented the paper which sets out an overview of the Park Authority's budget management position at the end of April - month one of the 2024 / 25 financial year. Louise highlighted at this early stage in the year the position on payroll and staff salaries against budget is a key point of assessment. The month one figures for actual costs are slightly below the phased budget position providing some early confirmation of the accuracy of budget estimates for this significant area of expenditure.
5. The Resources Committee discussed the paper and made the following comments:
  - a) The chair of Resources Committee thanked the Head of Finance and Corporate Operations for her papers.
  - b) David Cameron, Director of Corporate Services and Deputy CEO updated the Resources Committee that there had just recently been a change in budget for the Community Lead Local Development (CLLD) community development grant. This was for £258,000 inclusive of development and £57,000 of this is for staff costs.
6. The Resources Committee noted the paper.
7. Action point arising: none

## **Estimated Outturn**

8. Louise Allen, Head of Finance and Corporate Operations presented the paper which estimated outturn position for the 2023 / 24 financial year.
9. The Resources Committee discussed the paper and made the following comments:
  - a) Committee members sought clarification about the underspend on the Peatland restoration sites. Grant Moir, the CEO clarified that the final costs of restoring a site depend on the nature of the work required: ditch blocking costs less than the restoration of bare peat and a site may come in less expensive than anticipated depending on the proportion of ditch blocking work involved.
  - b) Head of Finance and Corporate Operations also commented that initial budgets are set based on a grading of complexity. The peatland restoration has come in under budget owing to the projects undertaken being less complex than anticipated.
10. The Resources Committee noted the paper.



11. Action point arising:

- i. Committee would like updates about the peatland restoration grants and more information of the different types of restoration undertaken.

## **Organisational Development and People Strategy 2024 – 2027**

12. Kate Christie, Head of Organisational Development presented the paper which sets out an overview of the many changes that have taken place within the organisation since the last Organisational Development Strategy of 2019, and how these changes have informed the emerging Organisational Development and People Strategy (ODPS), which is designed to give our staff the framework and support to be able to deliver our ambitions around nature, people and place

13. The Resources Committee discussed the paper and made the following comments:

- a) Board members approved of adding the word “people” to the title of the strategy as it feels very personable, and people focused. They requested that feedback on the outcomes of the values and culture comes back to the board at an appropriate time.
- b) A board member requested the addition of “external stakeholders” to the wording in the section about the overarching vision of the ODPS. That being “...supports staff to achieve excellence in their work, their behaviour and their relationships with each other and external stakeholders”. This was agreed by officers.

*Lauren joined 02.54pm*

- c) A board member raised concerns about the value and wording of some of the questions and results in the survey. The Head of Organisational Development replied that they have no capacity to amend or change the questions as this is prescribed by Best Companies who design the Staff Survey. She explained that the survey does also include the opportunity for staff to give open ended responses to several questions e.g. “what is great about the organisation and what would you like to change about the organisation”. These comments will be scrutinised, and a report provided in due course.
- d) A board member noted the results were really positive across the majority of factors, with good results in staff and management relationships. However, they noticed there were some issues with workload and boredom, what about their motivations? Requesting more background on this at another stage.



- e) A board member mentioned the importance of staff living in the park and questioned the difficulties around recruitment and housing in the area. Head of Organisational Development noted the importance of staff living in the National Park communities and explained that our Hybrid Working Policy does not allow for permanent home working contracts, except in the circumstances of short term internship contracts. As such our recruitment continued to have an emphasis on staff living in communities within and around the Park.
- f) Discussions were had around the new 35 hours work week and the effect this is having on staff and their workload and productivity. It was stated that there was a flexible working policy in place to ensure staff are not over working and managers monitor this. In addition, staff have regular Performance Development Conversations with their line managers, and workload should be discussed at these meetings
- g) A board member questioned how individuals are rewarded for going above and beyond to progress in the organisation or personally? Officers stated that we have a good mix of staff with some working above and beyond the expectations of their roles, but also that it was equally acceptable that some staff simply do enough to deliver the requirements of the role. A member commented staff should only be expected to carry out their contracted hours and that should be valued and anything over that is their personal choice as many people may have caring or other commitments meaning they cannot work above and beyond. Officers stated that the organisation maintains a good training budget, encouraging employees to undertake training both on existing skills and to develop new skills to allow them to work towards their future roles, advertising jobs internally first. A Board member suggested that there are positive employment stories, which together with the support for training, and personal development should be shared with the public as a good news story, this to be discussed with Head of Communications and Engagement.
- h) A board member questioned what training staff had for dealing with the public. It was highlighted, there was lots of training opportunities published on Eólas, our intranet, and also that we have an excellent online training portal, ELMS, which covers a large variety of training. Officers reported that we had arranged specific training recently for certain projects, on “dealing with difficult people”, and “safe and sound” training is delivered for rangers to enhance their skills when dealing with the public and knowing when to step back from a situation, among many more.

14. The Resources Committee noted the paper.



15. Action points arising:

- i. An update on the values and cultures work to be brought to a future meeting.
- ii. A change in the wording in the paper to “supports staff to achieve excellence in their work, their behaviour and their relationships with each other and external stakeholders”
- iii. Issues raised on approaches to staff motivation in the context of the survey results, more background on this to come back to the Board.
- iv. Good employment stories, training, and personal development to be shared with the public as a good news story, this to be discussed with Head of Communications and Engagement.

## **Health and Safety Committee Minutes**

16. Kate Christie, Head of Organisational Development, introduced this paper and noted that this is a standard item that comes to the Committee to provide oversight of the meeting and of Health and Safety matters generally.

17. The Resources Committee discussed the paper and made the following comment:

- a) A board member raised a question regarding lone working, ensuring all staff know the policy and have the correct equipment. Head of Organisational Development stated that we are in the process of upgrading approach and communications around lone working and aim to deliver workshops for staff on lone working options once the upgrade is completed. Board members requested a follow up ensuring staff were following procedures.

18. The Resources Committee noted the paper.

19. Action point arising:

- i. Follow up on lone working, ensuring staff are following procedures to be brought to a future meeting.

## **Draft Staff Consultative Forum Minutes**

20. Kate Christie, Head of Organisational Development, introduced this paper and noted that this is a standard item that comes to the Committee to provide oversight of the meeting and of Staff Consultative Forum matters generally.



21. The Resources Committee discussed the paper and made the following comment:

- a) Lots of positive feedback for the Head of Organisational Development on the progressive policies being put in place such as Pregnancy Loss and Neurodivergence. A board member requested to see all policies available, which the Head of Organisational Development confirmed are all online as we have moved away from having paper copies of the staff handbook. It was highlighted the Head of Organisational Development's policy development has been recognised externally and she has been invited to speak at several national conferences on key policy topics

22. The Resources Committee noted the paper.

23. Action point arising:

- i. Board members would like to see Eólas to read through the policies available or have a handbook available for Board Members to read.

## **AOCB**

24. None.

**Date of next meeting:** 9 August 2024

Motion for confidential session to be set out will be to protect confidentiality of staff pay and conditions proposals prior to formal negotiations.

25. Meeting concluded at 03.38pm





## **Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting**

**Held at Cairngorms National Park Authority HQ, Grantown on Spey**

**Hybrid**

14 June 2024 at 10.00am

### **Present:**

Chris Beattie (Planning Convener)  
Eleanor Mackintosh (Deputy Planning Convener)  
Kenny Deans  
Russell Jones  
Lauren MacCallum

Sandy Bremner  
Peter Cosgrove  
Paul Gibb  
John Kirk

### **Virtual**

Geva Blackett  
Xander McDade  
Steve Micklewright  
Derek Ross  
Peter Ferguson, Harper MacLeod LLP

Dr Hannah Grist  
Dr Fiona McLean  
Ann Ross

### **Apologies**

Jackie Brierton  
Duncan Miller

Bill Lobban

### **In Attendance**

Gavin Miles, Director of Planning and Place  
Emma Bryce, Planning Manager, Development Manager  
Sarah Fletcher, Planning Officer, Development Planning and Environmental Advice  
Dan Harris, Planning Manager, Forward Planning and Service Improvement  
Karen Johnstone, Clerk to the Board



## **Agenda Item 1 and 2**

### **Welcome and Apologies**

26. The Planning Convener welcomed all present including members of the public and apologies were noted.

## **Agenda Item 3**

### **Declarations of Interest**

27. Russell Jones declared an interest on Item 6 as it has been discussed at Highland Council Planning Committee which he also sits on.

28. Derek Ross declared an Interest on Item 6 as previously made comments in national press about the cumulative effect and impact of wind farms on the landscape.

## **Agenda Item 4**

### **Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising**

29. The minutes of the previous meeting on 26 April 2024 held at Cairngorms National Park Authority, Grantown on Spey and Hybrid were approved with no amendments.

30. Matters Arising:

- a) Authority delegated to officers to take enforcement action to prevent further unauthorised development of the site if required.
- b) Planning Committee Convener to write to the applicant to convey the committee's significant disappointment at the retrospective nature of the application. *Completed*

## **Agenda Item 5**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2024/0005/DET (29/05974/FUL)**

Erection of 6 no. housing units (3 blocks of semi-detached housing) at Land 65M South of 22 Kerrow Drive, Kingussie.

31. Item 5 was not considered as officers had been informed of a change to the context of the application that would change the content of the papers prepared.



*10.05am Russell Jones and Derek Ross left the room ahead of Item 6.*

## **Agenda Item 6**

Dell 2 Windfarm, 2024/0068/PAC (ECU00003440)

**Recommendation:** no objection

32. Sarah Fletcher, Planning Officer, Development Planning and Environmental Advice presented the paper to the committee.

33. The Committee were invited to ask for clarity, and the following points were raised:

- a) A board member sought clarity on the impacts of the lights. Sarah Fletcher, Planning Officer explained that the lights are 200 candelas, however they will be dimmed automatically if they are seen beyond 5km. As the Park is 8km away, this should have very little effect on our dark skies.

34. The Committee were invited to discuss the report. The following points were raised:

- a) Board Members thanked the officer for the clarity in the report and for the breakdown of the effects and impacts this would have on us.

35. The Committee approved the application.

36. Action Points arising: none

*10.31am Derek Ross and Russell Jones returned to join the committee.*

## **Agenda Item 7**

### **AOCB**

37. Gavin Miles, Director of Planning and Place noted that they had received notification of an appeal against the enforcement notice served by the Park Authority on unauthorised development in Tolquhonie woods near Carrbridge. Officers will be responding to the appeal with the help of our legal advisers.

38. Gavin Miles, Director of Planning and Place updated the board that both new Senior Planners have started in the posts since the last planning committee. Colin Bryans



started a few weeks ago in the Development Management team and Jeff Pyrah started this week in the Forward Planning team, both were welcomed.

The Committee Convener raised a motion to move to a confidential session.

39. The public business of the meeting concluded at 10.33am

40. Date of the next meeting is 9 August 2024