
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING held at the Grant Arms Hotel, Grantown-on-Spey on Friday 14th May 2010 at 10am

PRESENT

Peter Argyle	Bob Kinnaird
Eric Baird	Mary McCafferty
Stuart Black	Eleanor Mackintosh
Geva Blackett	Anne MacLean
Duncan Bryden	Alastair MacLennan
Jaci Douglas	William McKenna
Dave Fallows	Ian MacKintosh
Lucy Grant	Andrew Rafferty
David Green(Convener)	Gregor Rimell
Drew Hendry	Richard Stroud
Marcus Humphrey	Sue Walker

In Attendance:

David Cameron	Alison Lax
Murray Ferguson	Karen Major
Bob Grant	Don McKee
Jane Hope	Hamish Trench

Apologies:

Fiona Murdoch

Welcome and Introduction

1. David Green welcomed everyone to the meeting, the first held at the Grant Arms Hotel. He referred to the Board's visit the previous evening to the new RSPB hide at Insh Marshes, an impressive new bird watching facility for visitors and residents of the Park.

Minutes of Last Meeting – approval

2. The minutes of the previous meeting (19th March 2010) were approved with one change to Paragraph 8(d).

Matters Arising

3. Further to the discussion about informal camping in the Cairngorms National Park, (Paragraphs 21-23) it was noted that an informal seminar had been arranged, and the issues raised at the previous Board meeting were under active consideration.

Declarations of Interest

4. Paper 2 – Geva Blackett declared an interest in respect of the discussion about the settlements at Ballater. Willie McKenna declared an interest in respect of the discussion about An Camas Mor. Both agreed to leave the meeting for these respective discussions.

Speyside Way Extension (Paper 1)

5. At the start of the item, the Convener reminded the Board that the Ministerial decision on the line of the route had been taken the previous year, and the CNPA was now charged with the implementation of that decision. Major McLaren had asked to address the Board and in the interests of natural justice, given the nature of the issue, the Convener proposed (and Members agreed) that he should be granted this request. In doing so, the Convener emphasised that the paper was not entertaining a change to the route.
6. Bob Grant introduced the paper by giving a quick overview of the process to date. In order to expedite the process of extending the Speyside Way, which had made no progress for a number of years previously, the CNPA took on responsibility from SNH for the conduct of early consultations on an extension to the route in 2005-06. Following this the CNPA Board recommended a preferred route (the Wade Route) to SNH, who had the statutory duty to advise Ministers. SNH then conducted further consultations on the contentious part of the route, but eventually concluded that the Wade Route remained the preferred route, and advised this accordingly to Ministers in late 2008. This was considered by Ministers, who also received representation from Major McLaren before taking a decision. In May 2009 the Environment Minister confirmed the Wade Route as the preferred route subject to the CNPA reaching path agreements with the relevant landowners, and securing planning permission.
7. The CNPA had therefore been discussing agreements with landowners and were making satisfactory progress. However, there had been clear information from McLaren/Webster's lawyers that the partnership sustained their objection to the line of the route through Kinrara Estate. This confirmed the position that Major McLaren had taken for some time, and the CNPA, having exhausted negotiations, had reached the stage of having little option but to use a path order in order to expedite the Minister's decision. The process was set out in the paper; the Board's approval to use a path order was now sought.
8. The paper also sought the Board's approval to a contribution towards the capital cost of developing the route. The total amount which appeared to be necessary to extend the route was a challenge, but was feasible, particularly if funding could be secured from European sources which would cease in 2014. It was therefore important to move with some speed and the funding application would be most likely to succeed if planning permission and path agreements were already in place.

9. Major McLaren was invited to address the meeting. He outlined what he saw as the drawbacks of the current route and suggested an alternative compromise route. He also suggested that there were problems with the preferred route (the Wade route) which couldn't be appreciated without a site visit.
10. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) A decision on the route had already been made by the Environment Minister; the Board was not being asked to change the route, but to approve the use of a path order.
 - b) The Minister's decision on the route had been made. A good deal of time and money had been invested in following due process and it was difficult to justify reopening that process. It was not clear what would be gained from a site visit.
 - c) The environmental aspects of the route had been fully covered in the SNH advice to the Minister who was fully aware of these when making her decision.
 - d) A Visitor Management Plan, to which Major McLaren had referred, applied to the promotion of access by Alvie Estate and did not apply to anyone else. The Minister was fully aware of the Visitor Management Plan when taking her decision on the Speyside Way extension. The primary purpose of the Visitor Management Plan had been to ensure there was not unregulated access from the Dalraddy Development into an SSSI; that agreement was still valid and was monitored by Highland Council. The advice given by SNH to the Minister had recognised that the long-distance route effectively managed access by channelling it along the route. That had been part of the justification and recommendation for the Wade route made by SNH.
 - e) Scottish Government Officials (among others) did do a site visit before the Minister reached a conclusion.
 - f) Many elements of the compromise route proposed by Major McLaren had been proposed and considered earlier in the long process of consultation through the various options considered. It was important to note that there were objections from other landowners and members of the public on the compromise route.
 - g) It was confirmed that the route was not an all-abilities path as it was not feasible to make it all-abilities along its entire length. However, the route would be made as accessible as possible.
 - h) It was noted that the cost of the extension was considerable, as was the cost to the CNPA. Further, the major engineering works required on the part of the route at issue, over Kinrara Estate, were likely to increase costs considerably (up to quarter of a million pounds) compared with alternatives. So the issue was value for money. Arguably the extension to this important long-distance route was a priority in the National Park. It was difficult to find hard data on the value added from such investment, however, creating a good quality route with good transport links was very likely to have benefits. A comparison could be made with the Deeside Way which, from Ballater provided a clear nine miles with only one gate. A recent visit had revealed that a local bike hire business directed many users to the route and this contributed up to 500 bike hires per month, and was a good illustration of the benefits of this type of route.
 - i) There was some discussion about the process surrounding the making of a path order. Once the CNPA gave notice of the intention to make an order, if an objection was made and not withdrawn within 28 days, the order could not be made until the Minister had appointed a person to conduct an inquiry, and set its terms. It was likely that the inquiry would in these circumstances be conducted by the Directorate of Planning and Environmental Appeals. While there clearly

had been instances of such inquiries being very long and drawn out, the Directorate did try to keep processes as informal and speedy as possible (as illustrated by the Inquiry on the Core Paths Plan). The CNPA had already flagged up the potential for this issue to be the subject of an inquiry, so that if it became necessary, it could take place without undue delay. The cost of the inquiry would be borne by the Scottish Government; the CNPA would bear its own costs of representation, but if the process was kept informal, these costs would be kept to a minimum.

- j) Costs at table I in the paper referred to capital costs; maintenance costs would be in addition to this but would not involve costs for a dedicated ranger as CNPA's Grant-in-Aid to Rangers already covered this. The Board paper in July 2009 had set out in more detail the arrangements for maintenance of the Speyside Way, and it was noted for purposes of the current meeting that the Park Authority were moving towards an agreement with the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust on the provision of maintenance of the whole of the route.
- k) As a point of clarification, it was noted that the request for approval in principle of a contribution of £250,000 towards capital costs should refer to approval for up to £250,000 on the basis that the CNPA would be looking to maximise leverage of funds from others, and not just those partners shown in table I.
- l) The question was asked what the alternative would be if the proposals in the paper were not accepted. This would be to inform the Minister that the CNPA could not implement the route. The assumption was that the Minister would then pass the issue back to SNH to consider again. The point was made that the various alternatives had already been looked at, and the CNPA had endorsed the process; there was no realistic option but to go forward with the recommendation of the paper. The procedure surrounding a path order provided for the current objection to be handled through due process involving a third party.

11. A motion was proposed by Gregor Rimell (seconded by Eric Baird) that the recommendations of the paper be approved. An amendment was proposed by Dave Fallows (seconded by Geva Blackett) that the decision on the recommendations should be delayed for a site visit to enable Members to consider the route and its engineering implications. The motion was carried by 12 votes to 9 with one abstention, as shown in the table below.

Name	Motion	Amend	Abstain
Peter Argyle			✓
Eric Baird	✓		
Stuart Black		✓	
Geva Blackett		✓	
Duncan Bryden	✓		
Jaci Douglas		✓	
Dave Fallows		✓	
Lucy Grant	✓		
David Green	✓		
Drew Hendry	✓		
Marcus Humphrey		✓	
Bob Kinnaird	✓		
Mary McCafferty		✓	

William McKenna		✓	
Eleanor Mackintosh	✓		
Ian MacKintosh		✓	
Anne MacLean	✓		
Alastair MacLennan	✓		
Andrew Rafferty		✓	
Gregor Rimell	✓		
Richard Stroud	✓		
Sue Walker	✓		
Total	12	9	1

12. **The recommendations of the paper were approved as follows:**
- a) **The Board noted the progress towards the development of the Speyside Way;**
 - b) **The Board approved the making of a path order in relation to the proposed path across Kinrara Estate; and**
 - c) **The Board approved in principle a contribution of up to £250,00 towards the capital costs of developing the route, subject to the development of a detailed funding package with support from partners.**

Analysis of Recommendations and Post Inquiry Modifications of the Local Plan (Paper 2)

13. Karen Major introduced the paper which sought the Board's formal agreement of the analysis of the recommendations made by the Reporters to the Local Plan considered at the Local Plan Inquiry(LPI); and the Board's formal agreement to carry out a consultation on the post-inquiry modifications which followed from this analysis. It was noted that the CNPA was required to respond to each of the recommendations in the LPI report and to give reasons for their response whether or not they were accepting modifications to the Local Plan. These proposed responses were shown in the annex to the paper, while the paper itself gave a succinct overview of these.
14. On general issues (paragraph 6-8 of the covering paper) the Reporters were very clear on the status and importance of the National Park Plan, and the role of the Local Plan in supporting that. As a result, they expressed the view that there was no need for the overarching policy 1 in the Local Plan. Instead, it was proposed that all decisions in the future would be closely assessed against the strategic objectives in the National Park Plan.
15. Conserving and Enhancing the Park was covered by paragraphs 9 to 11 of the Board paper. The broad thrust of the policies set out in this section of the Local Plan were supported by the Reporters albeit there were recommendations for some modifications in all of them. Members' attention was draw in particular to the recommendations in relation to wind farms where it was proposed to not agree with the recommendations from the Reporters to define "windfarm". Instead, it was proposed that impact was the issue rather than number of turbines, and more detailed guidance on the interpretation of the policy would be covered in the Supplementary Guidance on Renewables (due for consultation in the autumn). It was also noted in this section that the Reporters' view was very welcome that "special qualities" applied to the whole of the National Park and

not just to part of it, meaning that there was support to the notion of trying to maintain the integrity of the landscape across the whole of the National Park.

16. The section on Living and Working in the Park was covered by Paragraphs 12 to 19 of the Board paper. In the main this part of the Local Plan dealt with housing and employment and the main issue here was the housing land supply, covered by page 51 of the annex.
17. In brief, the study commissioned from the University of Manchester had originally generated a figure of 950 units. The Local Plan considered by the LPI had included an addition to this number to account for the probability of a certain number of homes being second homes and therefore unavailable to meet the genuine housing need. The total had therefore been 1,600 units. The Reporters concluded that this addition was not sufficiently substantiated and that only the figure of 950 was evidence-based. Accordingly, and on the recommendation of the Reporters, further tables were included in the appendix 2, which set out the most up to date position regarding the effective supply of sites as identified in the local authority figures (Land Audits), and within the Local Plan. From this it was clear the Local Plan must provide sufficient land to provide 774 units (950 less 176 completions since the start of the Local Plan process) to meet need out to the year 2016. Table 4 set out the sites with housing allocations in the Local Plan which could meet this need, and meet the requirement to look beyond 2016 and ensure a 5 year supply of effective land at all times. On this basis, the Plan allocated sufficient land for 835 units. This provided for an extra 61 as a degree of flexibility over and above the 774. The CNPA were required to monitor this number by publishing an annual audit of housing delivery.
18. A number of points were made in discussion.
 - a) The Local Plan Inquiry report still referred to 250 units at Ballater and it was noted this could become 25% of the revised total housing figure.
 - b) While Members recognised the need for housing, and the logic of the original higher number, clearly there was no wish to encourage second homes. The Local Plan still retained the policy of 25-40% of affordable housing in developments, and there was also a policy on affordably housing which enabled sites providing 100% affordable housing. These would help to ensure that the right type of housing was delivered. It was noted there was recognition from the Reporters that affordable housing was an issue in the Park despite their conclusion that CNPA's method of calculation could not be supported.
 - c) The provision for housing through the Local Plan was in practice a rolling process. So if the numbers emerging from annual audits proved insufficient, and if more sites were identified within the Plan period, these may be brought forward through phased development.
 - d) The debate about housing numbers in the Local Plan had clearly looked at the needs of the younger end of the population, but some concern was expressed that the needs of an ageing population, and the change in local authority policies towards increasing reliance on care in people's own homes, had not received the same level of attention. Strategies for caring for the elderly were increasingly depending on telecare and cluster housing, and this would have implications for levels of housing need.
 - e) There was some concern that second homes were still an issue not being tackled – the housing numbers provided for in the Local Plan could still end up being significantly made up of second homes rather than meeting genuine need.

Effective master plans were crucial in ensuring the right type of development to secure necessary levels of affordable housing. Sites that provided for mixed communities for mixed types of housing were likely to be less attractive for second homes. In the past developers had just provided layouts; in the future this should not be acceptable, as what was needed was well thought through plans. The CNPA should make clear that in dealing with planning permissions this was what was required.

- f) It was noted that the CNPA could not prevent second homes through planning policy. However the policies in the Local Plan did require 25-40% affordable homes on development sites, and also provided in favour of 100% affordable housing on development sites outside settlements (policy 24). So the policies in the Local Plan did allow for affordable housing even in areas not allocated in the settlement maps for development.
- g) There was some concern that the Reporter's recommendations to remove certain allocations in settlements could leave some communities with no housing allocation at all. However, further to the point made in (f) above, it was confirmed that the change in the housing total did not compromise individual communities with no housing allocation specified.
- h) It was confirmed that there was a policy relating to travellers but no specific allocation, as this was not flagged up in the numbers from local authorities.
- i) Members' attention was drawn to Page 122 of the annex which dealt with a Carbon Emissions Policy. National Planning Advice Note (PAN) 84 had recently been revoked by the Scottish Government, so relevant references would be removed from the Local Plan.

19. In the Enjoying and Understanding section of the Plan (paragraph 20 in the covering paper) it was noted that the policies in this section were largely supported, albeit with some minor changes to drafting.

20. Consideration followed of various settlements.

[Willie McKenna left the meeting]

21. **An Camas Mor.** The Local Plan Inquiry Report did not endorse inclusion of An Camas Mor, but neither did it recommend its removal, noting that the CNPA Board may nevertheless wish to include provision for this new settlement, in which case the justification needed expanding. That inclusion would be in line with the previous Local Plan, the existing Structure Plan and the principles already approved by the Board. The LPI Report observed that the case for inclusion had not been clearly made; it was therefore proposed to reiterate the justification more robustly as set out in the annex, making the point that An Camas Mor was part of a long-term strategy which went beyond the life of the Local Plan. An Camas Mor was not simply a housing application, it was a long-term ambition for an exemplar of sustainable development, for a thriving economy and communities in the National Park. The development of Aviemore was constrained and did not have capacity to accommodate further growth having reached its natural limits. It was noted that the Reporters commended the principles which the Board had approved in respect of An Camas Mor, and these would be added to the text. The recommendation to Members by the Planning Officers was that the CNPA should remain committed to An Camas Mor to provide a long-term growth opportunity for this part of Badenoch and Strathspey which would help meet the future needs of the area beyond the life of this Local Plan. It was noted that An Camas Mor was not considered

as part of the effective land supply in terms of house unit numbers, but this did not preclude the consideration of applications as they came forward, and development starting prior to 2016.

22. A comparison was drawn with Banff National Park in Canada where development of the settlement of Banff had been successfully managed to provide a tightly constrained site straddling the river. Development of Aviemore was now constrained and to move across the river was the obvious way to go, and experience in Banff showed that this could be managed successfully. Attention was also drawn to the development at Coylumbridge Hotel which demonstrated what can be done with good landscaping. It was noted that An Camas Mor provided the opportunity to build the right type of houses; if it was turned down now that option would be lost.

[Willie McKenna returned to the meeting.]

[Geva Blackett left the meeting]

23. **Ballater.** It was noted that a master plan was the best way of meeting the Reporters' suggestion that more clarity was required on what was expected from development on this site. The recommendation was that the allocation remained as in the modified Deposit Local Plan.

[Geva Blackett returned to the meeting]

24. **Aviemore.** The LPI Report recognised the extent of development in recent years, and that Aviemore did not have the capacity to accommodate further growth. They recommended that the settlement boundary should be the A9. It was recognised that the High Burnside development did not fit within this envelope; the logic of the settlement boundary remaining at the A9 was to prevent further creeping development that could result from incremental addition to High Burnside, which was not desirable. This recommendation was welcomed, as the continual development of settlements did not necessarily equate with development of communities.

25. **Grantown-on-Spey.** Paragraph 29 of the Board paper explains that the Reporters concluded that land allocation H1 should be removed as an allocation on the basis that this did not meet the test of being an effective land supply (the tests for an effective land supply are set out in the Scottish Planning Policy 3). The recommendation was therefore that this allocation in the Local Plan be removed. However, it was noted that the Local Plan Inquiry Report did consider that in a reduced form this site may have potential for development. The proposal was therefore to leave the settlement boundary as it was and consider any further applications as appropriate and on their merits. The possibility of housing on the site was therefore not precluded simply by removing the allocation in the Local Plan. Meanwhile through the early work on the next Local Plan, and the call for sites to be identified, it would be an opportunity to revisit this boundary. It was noted that the main issues report on the next Local Development Plan would be coming to the Board in May 2011.

26. It was noted that the Local Plan Inquiry Report remained a material consideration in respect of any further planning applications, so there was no great danger of a large and inappropriate development going ahead; the door remained open to appropriate development. It was noted that it would be helpful to look for ways of celebrating what was good about that site, rather than focusing on its lack of suitability for large-scale housing development. This suggested a rational and considered approach in the next

Local Development Plan to protecting open space and balancing this against proposals for housing.

[Bob Kinnaird left the meeting]

27. **Kingussie.** The CNPA were content that the site remained effective and could be developed in a phased way to meet the needs of the community for the life of the Plan and beyond. The Local Plan Inquiry Report had recommended that the site be reduced to 55; however, the proposal was to keep this site in the Plan as it met the test of effective land supply.

[Bob Kinnaird returned to the meeting]

28. **Newtonmore.** There were two housing allocation sites in the Local Plan, both supported by the Local Plan Inquiry Report. There was therefore no proposal for change.

29. **Boat of Garten.** For a variety of reasons, including landscape and natural heritage considerations, the Reporters had concluded that this site allocated in the Local Plan could not be considered as an effective land supply and should be removed as an allocation from the Local Plan. Planning Officers recommended that this be accepted but as with Grantown-on-Spey, the settlement boundary should remain so that a smaller and more appropriate development could still be considered on its merits as a windfall development within that boundary. The point was made that the Boat of Garten community faced something of a crisis with a very high proportion of holiday and second homes and a falling school roll. A letter from the Community Council had reinforced the need for housing in Boat of Garten, and indeed the community had supported the housing allocation during the Local Plan Inquiry.

30. It was stressed that the discussion about Boat of Garten should focus on the generality, and on principles, as there was a live application under consideration. It was stressed again that the proposal to remove the allocation but retain the settlement boundary meant that affordable housing could still be provided within Boat of Garten. Policies within the Local Plan did provide for 100% affordable housing sites. It was suggested that in the context of the current Local Plan, Planning Officials should meet the community to consider their needs and then work with the Highland Council and RSLs to see what proposals could be brought forward. There was some further discussion about the natural heritage issues which had concerned the Reporters, involving a number of species and habitats, the most significant of which involved Capercaillie. There had been some disagreement about the counts of Capercaillie present in the woodland; these aside, the area clearly contained a number of habitats which were of importance to this protected species and the site was part of a network of sites of significant importance to the vitality and viability of the national population. Building on the proposed site was concluded to be likely to cause significant disturbance to the birds, not just through the building itself, but to the increase in people and dogs taking recreation.

31. The Convener concluded this section by noting that both aspects, namely conservation and community needs were being respected here and confirmed that the Planners would take forward discussion with the community and other partners to see how affordable housing could be provided within Boat of Garten.

32. **Carrbridge and Nethy Bridge.** The Reporters had recommended that in the light of a variety of factors housing sites in both Carrbridge and Nethy Bridge were not effective and should be removed. In both cases the sites in question had outline planning consent, and the CNPA Planners therefore did not accept these recommendations and proposed that the sites should be retained within the Local Plan. In relation to Carrbridge, it was noted that the site in question had been the subject of a planning applications which the Highland Council had refused, and which had then been granted on appeal. There now appeared to be a different section of the Reporters Unit recommending the opposite, i.e. that the site should be removed from the Local Plan. Nevertheless, the fact of live applications led to the recommendation by the Planning Officials that the site should be retained in the Local Plan.
33. A number of other issues were raised, not related to specific sites:
- a) On page 80 of the Annex at Paragraph 1.2, it was noted that the Reporters had recommended there was no scope for a Local Plan Policy which supported development that “had even a minimal impact on the landscape”. This seemed at odds with reality as any development had some impact. This observation had referred to Policy 7 in respect of landscape where the reporter had noted that the first aim of the National Park concerned conservation and enhancement as opposed to conservation or enhancement. So the Reporters had simply been supporting the use of the word “and”. It was confirmed that guidance would be used to clarify this point and to help developers, but the intention was certainly not to preclude all development. It was noted that Policy 7 did indeed provide for mitigation of any impact.
 - b) Page 188 - while the text referred to tourism related development the title of the policy still referred to tourism development. It was confirmed that the correct phrase was “tourism related development”.
 - c) Page 276 - it was noted that Dulnain Bridge did not have a primary school and a correction was needed.
 - d) Page 106 - Policy 13 referred to mineral and soil/earth resources. There was some discussion about the title of this policy to make clear it was about mineral, soil and peat. However, the conclusion had been to revert to the original title rather than introduce new terminology at this stage.
 - e) A plea was made for plain English as far as possible.
34. It was confirmed that the CNPA’s legal advice was that as the Local Plan moved towards adoption it gathered more weight. Because in the main the Reporter’s recommendations on the Local Plan were being accepted, the Local Plan now carried considerable weight and should be taken into account in determining planning applications. Nevertheless care was still required in the weight given to the Plan as it was not yet adopted but was merely a material consideration. For clarity, a paper would be brought to the next Board to ensure that the CNPA and other local authorities were informed on the status of the Local Plan.
35. The Convener concluded the discussion by thanking everyone involved, both officers and the general public who had contributed to the Local Plan. He confirmed the consultation on the Post Inquiry Modifications would start on the 24th May for six weeks. Comments would be analysed and brought back to the Planning Committee for final approval around September/October 2010.

36. The Board approved the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) **Accepted the analysis of the Reporters' recommendations appended to the Report.**
- b) **Accepted the Post Inquiry Modifications to the Local Plan and agreed the commencement of the period of consultation (24th May to 2nd July 2010.**

Supplementary Planning Guidance – Approval for Public Consultation (Paper 3)

37. Alison Lax introduced the paper which sought the Board's formal approval to consult on a suite of draft Supplementary Planning Guidance which would support the Local Plan once adopted. The Supplementary Planning Guidance was intended to assist applicants in understanding the requirements for their planning application and added a level of detail which was inappropriate for the Local Plan itself. The guidance would support the adopted Local Plan and would form a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and appeals. The topics covered by the current suite of guidance were: water resources, open space, affordable housing, natural heritage, the Sustainable Design Guide, conversion and reuse of existing traditional vernacular buildings, housing development in rural building groups, and a series of site specific development briefs. It was noted that the guidance on carbon emissions had been withdrawn because, as stated earlier in the meeting the Scottish Government's Planning Advice Note on Carbon Emissions had been revoked. Therefore, the CNPA's Supplementary Guidance, which had been based on this PAN, could no longer be relevant. Nevertheless the CNPA was committed to producing guidance on the subject but this would have to be revisited and would be brought back to the Committee in due course.

38. The Guidance had no materiality in planning applications at the moment as these were draft documents and were going out to consultation for the first time.

39. A number of comments were made in discussion:

- a) **Open space:** at paragraph 5.2 the point was made that incremental addition to the number of houses in a settlement could eat into the proportion of open space; at paragraph 5.6 it was important that the local community were involved in consultation. Similarly, at paragraph 8.2, some sense was needed of the community involvement in management of an area.
- b) **Sustainable Design Guide:** it was confirmed that there was nothing in this guidance which was at odds with building regulations.
- c) **In practice,** several items of guidance required developer contributions. Separate guidance on developer contributions would pick up all of these, including any in respect of carbon emissions.
- d) **In general** several pieces of guidance seemed to require developers to provide particular information. It was important that there were adequate processes in place to ensure that applicants were able to submit valid applications with the right information, without it appearing that the Planning Teams (whether CNPA or local authority) were continually asking for more information. It was noted this was a constant challenge, and that the new planning regulations would help in this respect. The CNPA was undertaking some intensive work with all the local authorities in the light of the Local Plan and the emerging guidance to ensure good processes in place to help the applicants.

40. The Board approved the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) **Approved the following Draft Supplementary Guidance for consultation:**
 - i. **Water Resources**
 - ii. **Open Space**
 - iii. **Affordable Housing**
 - iv. **Natural Heritage**
 - v. **The Sustainable Design Guide**
 - vi. **Conversion and Reuse of Existing Traditional and Vernacular Buildings**
 - vii. **Housing Development in Rural Building Groups**
 - viii. **Site Specific Development Briefs**
- b) **Approved the consultation on the Supplementary Guidance from the 24th May to the 24th September 2010.**

Delivery of the Scotland Rural Development Programme in the National Park – Land Management Support Officers (Paper 4)

41. This paper was for information. Two comments were made:
42. Some concern was expressed that the CNPA were still having difficulty getting data on agricultural holdings from the Scottish Government. This had been an ongoing problem, despite such initiatives such as SEARs apparently bring together public sector bodies to give an improved service to customers. It was confirmed that CNPA staff were continuing to take this up at the highest level with the Scottish Government; in fact both NPAs were engaged in this but it remained a stubbornly difficult problem to deal with in practice.
43. An observation was made that the paper did not make explicit what the provisions would be for the continuity of the Land Management Support Officers Project. It was confirmed that a more substantial proposal would be brought to the Board shortly on the back of discussions which were currently under way.

Annual Review of National Park Plan Delivery (Paper 5)

Corporate Plan Monitoring (Paper 6)

44. Papers 4, 5 and 6 were for information and were duly noted with no further discussion..

AOCB

45. A number of points of information were made as follows:
 - a) David Green reported on his attendance at a Land Seminar sponsored by the Highland Council, the main proposal being the establishment of an umbrella organisation to help communities take control of their own assets.
 - b) Duncan Bryden reported there had been a considerable amount of work required on planning matters in the last two months. He and Eric Baird had joined a meeting of IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) representatives who were visiting Scotland. He had chaired a Wild Camping meeting at the Lecht, following the Board discussion on this subject; this had

- been a useful meeting, involving police, landowners, and representatives from Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority.
- c) Eric Baird had been involved at an event at Glen Tanar which brought student teachers into the National Park as part of the Park's education project.
 - d) Geva Blackett reported she had attended a North East Recording Forum; the North Hunt Conference; and a Hill Tracks meeting which had been very well received by land managers, and particular thanks went to Matthew Hawkins in respect of that event.
 - e) Sue Walker had attended a meeting of CDAG (Cairngorms Deer Advisory Group), a group which was making excellent progress towards a strategy for deer management across the National Park; thanks went to Will Boyd-Wallis for his efforts in progressing this work.
 - f) Dave Fallows reported his attendance at an Association of National Park Authorities Workshop on Sustainable Transport in Wales.
 - g) Ian MacKintosh reported on the event to mark the opening of the Glen Doll Ranger Centre; the building of the Ranger Centre had been a partnership between Forestry Commission Scotland, SNH, CNPA, and Angus Council.
 - h) Drew Hendry had chaired the first meeting of the Sustainable Tourism Forum, attended by a wide selection of people.

Date of Next Meeting

46. Friday 9th July 2010, Braemar Village Hall.