

**CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

---

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

held at The Duke of Gordon Hotel  
on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2011 at 10.30am

**PRESENT**

Peter Argyle  
Duncan Bryden  
Angela Douglas  
Jaci Douglas  
Dave Fallows  
Katrina Farquhar  
Kate Howie  
Marcus Humphrey

Bob Kinnaird  
Eleanor Mackintosh  
Ian Mackintosh  
Mary McCafferty  
Willie McKenna  
Gordon Riddler  
Gregor Rimell  
Brian Wood

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mary Grier  
Andrew Tait  
Frances Thin

Robert Grant  
Pip Mackie  
Murray Ferguson

**APOLOGIES:**

David Green  
Gregor Hutcheon  
Allan Wright

# APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

## **AGENDA ITEMS 1 & 2: WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

1. The Convenor welcomed all present and advised that due to staff commitments Paper 7 would be taken after Paper 4.
2. Duncan Bryden informed Members that due to staff illness and other commitments various members of staff would be presenting papers in lieu of others and they would be identified at the meeting progressed.
3. Apologies were received from the above Members.

## **AGENDA ITEM 3: MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

4. The minutes of the previous meeting, 27<sup>th</sup> May 2011, held at The Village Hall, Newtonmore were approved.
5. There were no matters arising.
6. Duncan Bryden provided an update on the Action Points from the previous meeting:

- **Action Point at Para. 37:**

Bruce Luffman was currently in discussions with the Applicant to resolve any contraventions and if no resolution could be reached an Enforcement Notice would be served.

- **Action Point at Para. 50:**

The actions had been incorporated into the consultation response and it had been submitted to the Scottish Government.

- **Action Point at Para. 65:**

The CNPA were still awaiting resolution of the issue regarding Bats.

- **Action Point at Para. 74:**

SEPA had removed their objection and the Decision Notice had been issued.

- **Action Point at Para. 87:**

The CNPA were still waiting for Historic Scotland to list the existing croft house.

- **Action Point at Para. 99:**

The information regarding Micro Hydro schemes would be circulated once available. Aberdeenshire Council Planning Gain Service were willing to do a presentation on the work that they carry out. Since Stuart Robertson had retired, the presentation would probably be done by Karine Suller, the current senior Planning Gain Officer.

**AGENDA ITEM 4:  
OUTCOME OF ELECTRONIC CALL-IN**

7. The content of the Outcome of the Electronic Call-in held on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2011 was noted.

**AGENDA ITEM 5:  
DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS ON ANY ITEMS APPEARING  
ON THE AGENDA**

8. Mary McCafferty declared an indirect interest in Item No. 7 (Paper 2) on the Agenda, due to the Applicant having carried out work on machinery belonging to her husband.

**AGENDA ITEM 6:  
REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF  
HOUSE AT LAND TO EAST OF CORRIECHULLIE, GRANTOWN-ON-SPEY  
(PAPER 1) (09/015/CP)**

9. Mary Grier presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.
10. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) For which proposed design was approval being sought, either with single windows or double windows on the lower front elevation. Mary Grier confirmed it was the elevation with double windows on the lower front elevation.
  - b) The possibility of enlarging the width of the proposed single window in the draft elevation to the dimensions of the double windows, to allow more natural light into the dwelling. Mary Grier clarified this had been discussed with the Agent. However, it was felt that enlarging the horizontal aspect of the single windows by such proportions would impact on the symmetry of the dwelling and their relationship to the dormer windows.
11. The Committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:
- a) The possibility of slightly increasing the horizontal aspect of the single window, to be delegated for discussion between the Planning Officers and the Applicant / Agent.
  - b) Comparison to a recently constructed dwelling located nearby and its non traditional features.
  - c) The dwelling being a traditional, vernacular design and the single window being appropriate.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

12. Jaci Douglas proposed a Motion to approve the application as recommended in the Planning Report. This was seconded by Peter Argyle.
13. Willie McKenna proposed an Amendment to approve the application as recommended in the Planning Report but with the omission of Condition 3b, regarding amendments to the fenestration.

14. The vote was as follows:

NAME	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Peter Argyle	X		
Duncan Bryden	X		
Angela Douglas	X		
Jaci Douglas	X		
Dave Fallows		X	
Katrina Farquhar	X		
Kate Howie	X		
Marcus Humphrey	X		
Bob Kinnaird	X		
Eleanor Mackintosh		X	
Ian Mackintosh	X		
Mary McCafferty		X	
Willie McKenna		X	
Gordon Riddler	X		
Gregor Rimell	X		
Brian Wood	X		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

15. The Committee agreed to approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.

16. **Action Points arising:** None.

**AGENDA ITEM 7:  
REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR AGRICULTURAL  
SHED AT ASHFIELD, DRUMGUISH, KINGUSSIE  
(PAPER 2) (11/097/CP)**

17. Duncan Bryden informed Members that a request had been made to address the Committee from –

- Objector: John Barton

18. The Committee agreed to the request.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

19. Robert Grant presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.
20. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) The height of the existing buildings in the vicinity of the proposed shed. Robert Grant confirmed they were of an equal height to the shed being proposed (approx. 5.5m high).
  - b) The materials to be used for the construction of the building. Robert Grant stated that the roadside elevation was to be timber clad whilst the remaining elevations were to be green coloured sheet steel.
  - c) The possibility of introducing timber cladding on the end gables was also raised. Robert Grant advised that discussion had taken place with the Applicant regarding this. However, the Applicant had not been keen to progress this idea and so appropriate tree planting had been proposed to screen the building.
  - d) If the tree planting were to replace the trees which had previously been felled. Robert Grant advised that the felling did not require planning consent and the proposed tree planting was to be part replacement and part landscaping.
  - e) Drumguish being a historical crafting community.
  - f) Concern regarding the size of the building, even after the reduction to the current proposed size.
21. John Barton, Objector, addressed the Committee. The presentation covered the following points:
- Not being opposed to the Applicant having a shed / garage, but concerned regarding the size of the proposed building and its visual impact, even after the reduction.
  - The settlement pattern of Drumguish.
  - The reduction over time in the number of crofts in Drumguish.
  - The Applicant having registered his property as a croft but there being no livestock on the croft and the construction / plant type machinery currently stored on the site.
  - The size of shed, as recommended by the Crofters Commission, being approximately 30m<sup>2</sup> for a croft of this size.
  - The proposed size of building being more suited to industrial purposes.
  - Welcoming the possibility of a Site Visit by Members to assess what size building could be feasibly accommodated on the site.
  - The negative visual impact the building could have for walkers using the Speyside Way and the impact on tourism to the area.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

22. The Committee were invited to ask questions of the speaker and the following points were raised:
- a) If local residents would rather see a shed on the site rather than the current collection of plant machinery. John Barton responded that he could only speak personally, but he would be happy to see a shed / domestic garage on the site but not an industrial building.
23. Duncan Bryden thanked the speaker.
24. The Committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:
- a) The possibility of a Site Visit for Members to assess the visual impact of the building, particularly due to the close proximity to popular walking routes in the area. It was also suggested that the CNPA Landscape Officer should be present at any Site Visit.
  - b) The large size of the proposed building when compared to the scale of the agricultural workings of the croft.
  - c) Concern regarding the height of the building in relation to the other buildings in the vicinity.
  - d) Timber clad buildings being more aesthetically pleasing in rural environments and the possibility of using fibre cement roofing.
  - e) Clarification if the Planning Committee have the ability to specify the dimensions of any approved building. Robert Grant confirmed that this was within the remit of the Planning Committee.
  - f) If the proposed building was the smallest size that the Applicant would consider. Robert Grant stated that the building had been reduced in scale from the original submitted proposal. Discussion had taken place and although there may be some scope to further reduce the height, the footprint of the building was the smallest the Applicant was currently willing to consider.
  - g) How the Committee could determine an acceptable size of building without refusing the current application. Robert Grant advised that an acceptable size of building would require further discussion with the Applicant.
  - h) The possibility of the Applicant providing professional architects drawings to demonstrate the proposed building in relation to the other buildings in the vicinity. Robert Grant advised that this would be possible. However it would involve some cost to the Applicant. In addition the Local Authority had validated the submitted plans which were before the Committee.
  - i) The options available to the Planning Committee being a) Refusal, b) Deferment with a clear steer to the Planning Officers that the current proposed building was too large and negotiations on size and external finishes were required, and c) Deferment for a Site Visit, which would not potentially add anything to Members ability to assess the application. The preferable option being b).
  - j) If deferment were agreed, it would allow time for a Site Visit to be arranged.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

- k) The proposed height of the building being required to allow agricultural machinery to enter safely e.g. tractors with front loaders and bales. Therefore approval as recommended in the Planning Report was a viable option.
  - l) Concern about the potential time and travel required for Members to attend an arranged Site Visit. Normal practice being to arrange Site Visits for a time when a Planning Committee was at a nearby location. However, as no meetings were scheduled to take place close to Drumguish in the near future there was concern that there would be considerable delay in the application being brought forward for determination. Duncan Bryden reminded Members that they were free to visit the site in their own time.
  - m) Concern that deferring the application would not assist with encouraging young people into agriculture.
  - n) A proposal that the application be deferred for further discussion between the CNPA Planning Officers and the Applicant regarding a reduction in the overall size and scale of the building and appropriate construction materials to mitigate against any adverse visual impact.
25. The Committee agreed to defer the application to allow for further discussion regarding the overall size and scale of the shed and appropriate construction materials to mitigate against any adverse visual impact.
26. **Action Points arising:** CNPA Planning Officers to engage in discussions with the Applicant regarding the overall size and scale of the shed and appropriate construction materials to mitigate against any adverse visual impact.

### **AGENDA ITEM 8:**

#### **REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF 2 FLATS AND 2 SEMI DETACHED HOUSES (4 IN TOTAL) AT SITE SE OF GRANT ARMS HOTEL, 25 - 26 THE SQUARE, GRANTOWN-ON-SPEY (PAPER 3) (11/117/CP)**

27. Robert Grant presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.
28. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) Clarification of the flat roof glazed feature (North East elevation) and flat roof dormers (South West elevation). Robert Grant confirmed that the glazed feature and dormers were flat roofed and were considered to fit in with the flat roofed porch and the sleek lines of the contemporary building.
  - b) The proposal being for good housing of a modern and innovative design, in an area of Granttown on Spey in which people wished to live.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

- c) Welcoming the pedestrian only access from the development site to South Street.
  - d) Concern about the practicality of flat roofs in the adverse climate conditions the area experienced on a regular basis and the possibility of a slight pitch to the roof to allow water run-off. It was presumed that the Architect had already considered.
29. The Committee agreed to approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.
30. **Action Points arising:** None.

**AGENDA ITEM 9:  
REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR VARIATION TO  
CONDITION 1 OF CONSENT 04/120/CP (04/00076/OUTBS) AT THE  
AVIEMORE CENTRE, GRAMPIAN ROAD, AVIEMORE  
(PAPER 4) (11/110/CP)**

31. Andrew Tait presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to the condition stated in the report.
32. The Committee discussed the application and the following point was raised:
- a) The possibility of the blue fencing surrounding the site to be painted a more visually sympathetic colour. Andrew Tait advised that this point could be raised with the Applicant. However, he had been advised that the Applicants were looking to rapidly progress the application.
33. The Committee agreed to approve the application subject to the condition stated in the report.
34. **Action Points arising:** None.

**AGENDA ITEM 12:  
REPORT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSE REPORT TO HIGHLAND  
COUNCIL - DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: ONSHORE  
WIND ENERGY  
(PAPER 7)**

35. Andrew Tait & Frances Thin, CNPA Landscape Officer, presented a consultation response and recommended that the Committee endorse the response for submission to the Highland Council. Andrew Tait advised that papers had been circulated to Members setting out the reasons for designating areas 4a and 4b.



## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

36. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) The position of the A9, CNP Boundary and proposed Wind Farms in relation to the designated areas (4a and 4b).
37. The Committee discussed the report and the following points were raised:
- a) Clarification of an 'intervisibility analysis'. Frances Thin responded that it was a mapping technique, for example: zones of theoretical visibility, in which a location was chosen and the visual impact of the proposed development was then assessed from that particular location.
  - b) The possibility of specifying crucial locations from which intervisibility analyses should be carried out. Frances Thin responded that this would be difficult as it would depend on where the proposed development was to be located, but the most elevated locations in the CNP would appear consistently in these studies.
  - c) The document being a good example of collaborative working between the CNPA and the Highland Council.
38. The Committee endorse the response for submission to the Highland Council.
39. **Action Points arising:** The consultation response to be submitted to Highland Council.

### **AGENDA ITEM 10: REPORT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSE REPORT TO SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT: NON DOMESTIC PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (PAPER 5)**

40. Bruce Luffman, Monitoring & Enforcement Officer, presented a paper concerning the proposed consultation response and recommended that the Committee discuss the submission to the Scottish Government. Bruce Luffman advised that further issues had arisen since the paper had been drafted and there was still a need for further discussion internally and with SNH before the response could be finalised.
41. Bruce Luffman advised that he would be liaising with Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority (LLTNPA) early next week to try and achieve a consistent, comprehensive response from both National Park Authorities. He advised that LLTNPA had given a fuller response to question 19 regarding Caravans and Caravan Parks, highlighting their past experience with these issues. This type of issue could arise in the CNP and therefore this would be incorporated into the CNPA response.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

42. Bruce Luffman advised that he had recently had a discussion with SNH (to be continued next week) regarding the consultation. SNH were due to meet with the Scottish Government the following week, prior to their response being submitted. Bruce Luffman informed Members that SNH had concerns with the current draft CNPA response regarding questions 21 – 23 (Tracks & Private Ways) –
- Question 21 Bullet Point 6: which suggested a similar Prior Notification procedure to that used for Agricultural Buildings could be used for this purpose. SNH had raised concern that under PAN 39 (Farm and Forestry Buildings) it is stated that ‘the principle of whether the development should be allowed is not a relevant consideration’ meaning that although the CNPA would receive Prior Notification of the development and could influence design, siting and appearance, the Authority could not refuse the principle of the application. Bruce Luffman advised that the response to the question would need amending as the intention was to propose a system akin to the Prior Notification procedure but through which, if necessary, a detailed planning application could be sought and assessed through the normal determination process including considerations of the principle.
- Bruce Luffman informed Members that it was proposed to have a system in which 3 options were available to the CNPA after a Prior Notification had been received:
- Option 1: The CNPA gives no advice on the proposal and the development proceeds
  - Option 2: The CNPA gives advice on the method and outcome of construction, or
  - Option 3: The CNPA requires a planning application to be submitted, due to the proposals significance to the Aims of the Park, and assessed through the normal determination process.
43. Bruce Luffman explained that parallel discussions were ongoing with SNH Loch Lomond and the Trossachs NPA and Scottish Government concerning the potential for removal of National Scenic Areas in National Parks so that all of the Parks would be treated with equivalent landscape status. Any proposals for changes would be subject to consultation by Scottish Government. In order for this proposal to be brought into effect it would require a slight amendment to the CNPA’s legislation. SNH had already indicated that in their response to the current consultations they were likely to recommend no Permitted Development Rights within the Park and a definition of Hill Tracks.
44. Bruce Luffman informed Members that the response had to be submitted to the Scottish Government by Friday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2011.
45. The Committee were invited to ask the Monitoring and Enforcement Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) Clarification of how emergency track repairs would be dealt with under the proposed procedure. Bruce Luffman responded that there would be no change to the current process, where situations were handled as they arose. However, the proposed system was to encourage dialogue between Developers / Land Owners and the CNPA prior to pre-arranged works.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

- b) If the existing regulation that allows up to 3 caravans (for holiday purposes) within the curtilage of a farm would be affected by these proposals. Bruce Luffman responded that there were no proposed changes to this regulation.
46. Bruce Luffman advised that the consultation period was not closed and that Scottish Government would wish to see all responses before coming to a view. It was very likely that any changes proposed would be considered very carefully by Scottish Government lawyers.
47. The Committee discussed the report and the following points were raised:
- a) The consultation response being a solid piece of work.
  - b) The approach being the correct one for Hill Tracks, as it would achieve clarity for all and avoid 'passing the buck'.
  - c) The Prior Notification process should be proportionate to the scale of works being proposed.
  - d) Clarification of what is considered to be a road or private way in relation to say footpaths which become something more. Bruce Luffman responded that all tracks and private roads and ways (Scottish Government words) have many users and attempting to define Hill Tracks would be open to 'grey areas'. However, the lawyers may want to define tracks but the understanding was in relation to tracks that are primarily for vehicular use.
  - e) The need to look at removing the need for an Operators Licence for Farmers Markets and reduce the bureaucracy surrounding this issue.
48. Murray Ferguson, Strategic Rural Development Director, requested that Members provide a steer for where priority attention needs to be given on hill tracks within the CNP, as to date it had been given to the open hill ground. By following the procedure being proposed it could require land owners to submit a Notification not only for track works on open hill ground but also on cultivated land and potentially for works associated with forestry. He noted that there may be concerns about additional works for land managers and impacts on staff resources.
49. The Committee responded and the following points were raised:
- a) The need to keep the system as simple as possible and avoid definitions for footpaths and Vehicle Hill Tracks.
  - b) The need to avoid the perception of the proposals being an imposition on land owners.
50. The Committee supported the consultation document with clarifications to emergency repair procedures, Caravans and Operators Licences for Farmers Markets.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

### 51. **Action Points arising:** Bruce Luffman to –

- Liaise with Jaci Douglas and Eleanor Mackintosh regarding the issue of removing the need for Operators Licences for Farmers Markets.
- Continue to liaise with LLTNPA, to try and achieve a cohesive response for both National Parks.
- Arrange with Don McKee to submit the response to the Scottish Government by Friday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2011.

### **AGENDA ITEM 11:**

#### **REPORT ON CNPA SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2011-12**

#### **(PAPER 6)**

52. Duncan Bryden informed Members that due to Don McKee, Head Planner, being absent, the report would be delivered by Murray Ferguson, Strategic Rural Development Director.
53. Murray Ferguson presented a report recommending that the Committee note the implementation of the Planning Service Improvement Plan (SIP) and the feedback received and approve the SIP for 2011/12 and delegate responsibility for implementation to the CNPA Management Team.
54. The Committee discussed the report and the following points were raised:
- a) The possibility of engaging in training for Schools. Murray Ferguson responded that this issue had been picked up in Annex D: Key Actions and Areas 2d.
  - b) The need to broaden the scope of who the CNPA engage with, not just Community Councils.
  - c) The low turn out to the organised Planning Awareness Events despite advertising.
  - d) The need for information to be drip fed and constantly reinforced to members of the public.
  - e) The possibility of the presentation being made available on the CNPA website to allow members of the public to view it in their own time.
  - f) The need to vary the times and places of meetings to allow members of the public to attend.
  - g) Members of the public not being interested in planning until it affects them directly, and this being a difficult area to try and address.
  - h) The outcome of planning applications being important not the speed of determination.
  - i) The possibility of lack of submitted information with a planning application being a reason for non validation and therefore referred back to the Local Authority. It was confirmed that the legally required information for validation was limited. However, refusing applications for lack of information seemed to spur Applicants into providing the information required.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

- j) Clarification if the Key Actions at Annex D, Point 1a regarding the CNPA becoming a full Planning Authority had been fed into the Campbell Christie review. Murray Ferguson responded that Jane Hope, Chief Executive, had sent a letter as part of the review process but he thought it covered more general issues regarding the CNPA and not any specific issues concerning planning powers.
  - k) Clarification of Key Action at Annex D 7a, regarding the delegation of refusals to the Head Planner and the possibility of requiring a similar process to the Local Authorities Local Review Bodies should an appeal be lodged. Murray Ferguson replied that the delegation of refusals referred to at paragraph 7a was only for cases where there was a lack of information submitted with the application and that this would be clarified in finalising the document. However, should this be taken forward this issue of how to deal with appeals would have to be addressed.
55. The Committee noted the implementation of the Planning Service Improvement Plan (SIP) and the feedback received. The Committee approved the SIP for 2011/12 and delegated responsibility for implementation to the CNPA Management Team.
56. **Action Points arising:** Murray Ferguson to arrange to finalise the Service Improvement Plan, clarify the points raised in discussion, and to submit to Scottish Government with a copy on the CNPA website.

### **AGENDA ITEM 13: UPDATE REPORT ON DESIGN MATTERS (PAPER 7)**

57. Duncan Bryden informed Members that due to Don McKee, Head Planner and Alison Lax, Strategic Policy Officer being absent, the report would be delivered by Murray Ferguson, Sustainable Rural Development Director.
58. Murray Ferguson advised that Frances Thin as a qualified design expert was available to assist with Members queries, but noted that she had not been directly involved in the production of the paper.
59. Murray Ferguson presented an update report on Design Matters and requested the Committee to note the contents and agree Part A - Agree the proposed programme for Design related work over the coming months as part of the Service Improvement Plan, and Part B - Agree the proposed way forward for the Aviemore Design Framework and creation of associated member/staff task and finish group.
60. The Committee discussed Part A of the report and the following points were raised:
- a) The Design programme being welcomed and looking forward to the training and progress of the Design Awards.
  - b) The enormous potential of the Design Awards and the benefits they would bring to the quality of design in the CNP.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

- c) Members being prepared to become involved in helping to progress the Design Awards.
  - d) Design being an issue which could be included in training for schools, it being one of the more exciting aspects of the planning process.
  - e) The statement at Paragraph 5 being correct, regarding a swift refusal being the appropriate way forward instead of trying to achieve a positive outcome from a middle category design proposal.
61. The Committee agreed to Part A, and agreed the proposed programme for Design related work over the coming months as part of the Service Improvement Plan.
62. Murray Ferguson requested that some Board Members volunteer to assist with the Aviemore Design Framework (ADF) in a task / finish group along with CNPA Staff, to tidy up elements of the document.
63. The Committee discussed Part B of the report and the following points were raised:
- a) It not being appropriate for the Aviemore Design Framework (ADF) to be transferred into Supplementary Planning Guidance, but it being an important document nonetheless.
  - b) Being uncomfortable with making the ADF publically available given Members uneasiness with the content of the document. Murray Ferguson responded that it was not a policy document and therefore would not be promoted as agreed policy. However, as a reference document it would have to be made available should a member of the public wish to view it.
  - c) The possibility of inviting Andrew McCracken, Highland Council Planning Officer, to join the task / finishing group to provide some history and depth to the subject. It was agreed that Andrew McCracken, along with other professional people in the fields of architecture and economic development would be invited to join the group.
  - d) Aviemore having been controlled by 1 or 2 developers over the years with additional development being carried out in a piecemeal fashion.
  - e) The group having a finite lifespan, meeting approximately 2 or 3 times to bring the piece of work to a close.
64. The Committee agreed Part B, and agreed the proposed way forward for the Aviemore Design Framework and creation of associated member/staff task and finish group.
65. **Action Points arising:** Board Members to contact Murray Ferguson in the first instance should they wish to be included in the ADF task / finishing group.

## APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

### **AGENDA ITEM 14: ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

66. Duncan Bryden advised Members that they would reconvene later that day (at 1.45pm) to discuss the Supplementary Planning Guidance consultations which in absence of other staff would be co-ordinated by Murray Ferguson.
67. Duncan Bryden informed Members that the planning applications at Feshiebridge Cottage, for which a Site Visit had been held on 10<sup>th</sup> June, would be brought forward for determination at the Planning Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011.
68. Duncan Bryden informed Members that Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority (LLTNPA) Staff had been up to the CNPA Ballater Office during June, helping to install a combined e-planning system for applications, which was a target identified in the Key Actions. The new system should improve the management of applications and allow all interested parties to interact with the process via the CNPA website. Duncan Bryden advised that some further testing of the system was required and should be going live late Summer / early Autumn 2011.
69. Duncan Bryden informed Members/Residents that Boat of Garten were holding a community meeting on Saturday 23<sup>rd</sup> June, as part of the programme of work on “Our Community a Way Forwards”. CNPA staff would be in attendance. Duncan Bryden advised Members that, if the applicant was able to provide the necessary information, it was hoped to bring the current housing application (08/272/CP) forward for determination to the Planning Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2011.

70. **Action Points arising:** None.

### **AGENDA ITEM 15: DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

71. Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011 at The Albert Memorial Hall, Ballater.
72. Committee Members are requested to ensure that any Apologies for this meeting are submitted to the Planning Office in Ballater.
73. The meeting concluded at 1.05pm.