

**CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

---

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**held Virtually**  
**on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2022 at 10:00am**

**Members Present:**

Dr Gaener Rodger (Convener)	
Eleanor Mackintosh (Deputy Convener)	Xander McDade
Chris Beattie	Doug McAdam
Geva Blackett	Willie McKenna
Bill Lobban	Dr Fiona McLean
Derek Ross	Willie Munro
John Kirk	Judith Webb
Russell Jones	Deirdre Falconer
Ann Ross	Anne Rae Macdonald
Janet Hunter	

**In Attendance:**

Emma Bryce, Planning Manager, Development Management  
Stephanie Wade, Planning Officer, Development Manager  
Gavin Miles, Head of Strategic Planning  
Peter Ferguson, Harper McLeod LLP  
Emma Greenlees, Planning Support Officer  
Mariaan Pita, Executive Support Manager

**Agenda Items 1 & 2:**  
**Welcome & Apologies**

1. The Convener welcomed all present and no apologies were noted.
2. The convener confirm that this meeting is live streamed and welcomed all those that joined the meeting.

*Deirdre Falconer joined the meeting at 10:08*

**Agenda Item 3:**

**Declaration of Interest by Members on Items Appearing on the Agenda**

3. Derek Ross declared an interest in item No. 6 and No. 7  
Reason: He had commented in public about the Scottish Government's decision to approve the Garbet windfarm contrary to the decision of Moray Council planning committee which he is part of and he made further general comments regarding wind farms and their effects on the landscape.

# APPROVED COMMITTEE MINUTES

## **Agenda Item 4: Minutes & Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting**

4. Minutes and confidential minutes of the previous meeting, 23<sup>rd</sup> of September 2022 were approved with no amendments.
5. Head of Strategic Planning provided an update on National Park Framework 4 that was presented before parliament earlier this week. He noted that it would become part of the statutory development plan in future and explained that it did not have any significant bearing on decisions being taken by the Committee at this stage, but that it was possible that the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit or DPEA would ask the CNPA if it changed the CNPA's response to any windfarm consultations outside the National Park in future.

## **Agenda Item 5: Detailed Planning Permission 2022/0291/DET**

Erection of temporary sales cabin

At Land 225M East of Carr Farm, Carr Road, Carrbridge

**RECOMMENDATION: Approve Subject to Conditions**

6. Stephanie Wade, Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the Committee.
7. The Committee were invited to ask points of clarity, the following points were raised:
  - a) Concerns about traffic calming and road safety were raised on Carr Road of the previous 2019 application and questioned if this has been installed prior to work on site.
  - b) Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that it hadn't yet been installed. The developer had attempted to get the necessary permission to undertake the work but had encountered problems in the processing of those applications with Highland Council. The council's road engineers had confirmed that development could start on site under the Construction Traffic Management Plan as the traffic calming measures were intended to slow residential traffic once the development was completed. The developer was now waiting for Highland Council's 20mph traffic orders for Carrbridge to be confirmed and could then implement the traffic calming measures.
  - c) Questions were asked about what CNPA are doing about complaints about traffic.
  - d) Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that CNPA officers were reinforcing the measures that the developer said they would do in their construction management traffic plan and were considering what formal action could be applied if necessary.
  - e) Clarity was asked on how long it will be before the traffic calming scheme is in place as the residents are concerned about this.
  - f) Head of Strategic planning reminded members that we were talking about the current planning application for a temporary sales cabin and not the previous



## APPROVED COMMITTEE MINUTES

- a) Clarification was asked on the photos shown as one member did not see any difference in one. The Planning Manager showed the photos again explained the relevant images.
18. The Committee were invited to discuss the report, the following points were raised:
- a) A member noted that at closest viewpoints, the change in impacts was probably not significant because of the existing wind turbines, but acknowledged that the additional impacts of the proposals on other areas was significant.
  - b) Members agreed that they would object to the proposal.
19. **The Committee agreed to OBJECT to the proposal for the reasons set out in the Officer's report.**
20. **Action Point arising: None.**

*Derek Ross joined the meeting 10:43*

### **Agenda Item 8: FOR INFORMATION**

#### **PRE/2022/0024 Proposal of Application**

Residential Development with Associated Access, Landscaping, SUDS and Ancillary Works at Site H1, Monaltrie Park, Ballater

21. Stephanie Wade, Planning Officer (Development Management) presented the paper to the Committee.
22. The Committee were invited to ask questions or comments the following points were raised:
  - a) Could accommodation be allocated for public or care sector employees? Head of Strategic Planning advised that the developer had been speaking to Aberdeenshire Council informally as a housing authority and that the developer was aware that Ballater is one of the communities where the CNPA was looking for 45% affordable housing and would be looking at the range of housing options that could allow that.
  - b) Clarity was asked on where the flood protection scheme is for Ballater, as a member recalled there were certain buildings that showed to be relocated to the site like the fire station. Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the study the member was referring had recommended movement of built development but had not undertaken any assessment of the practicality or viability of such changes.
  - c) A member questioned how the rents are set and how realistic mid-market rentals were as they thought they were too high. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that it was too early to know what would be proposed at this stage and that he had referred to mid-market rent as a possible example of the range of affordable housing options that might be proposed.

#### **RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Committee**

- a) **Note the Proposal of Application Notification for**
- b) **Note the CNPA Officer's advice on the issues to address; and**

## APPROVED COMMITTEE MINUTES

- c) **Make comment on any additional relevant issues to be addressed in any future application.**

23. The Committee noted the officer's report

24. **Action Point arising: None.**

### **Agenda Item 9: FOR INFORMATION**

#### **Planning Appeal Decision – 2021/0168/DET (PPA-001-2025)**

**Erection of 8 holiday lodges and plant/storage building, formation of vehicle access, parking and turning areas, installation of sewage treatment plant and surface water soakaways,**

**Land north-west of Glen Clova Hotel, Glen Clova, Angus, DD8 4QS**

25. Gavin Miles, Head of Strategic Planning presented the paper to the Committee.

26. The Committee were invited to ask questions or comments and no points were raised.

27. **The Committee noted the officer's report.**

28. **Action Point arising: None.**

### **Agenda Item 10: AOB**

29. Concern was raised by a member in response to item 9 because when they read the planning appeal decision, they considered there were inconsistencies between individual reporters' decisions. They considered that the different reporter decisions in separate planning appeals had interpreted policy differently and asked if the CNPA could do anything to improve the DPEA's processes in decision-making.

30. The Head of Strategic Planning responded that both applications were different and that both appeals were different. He explained that the reporters had applied the same policies in the two cases in the same way, but that in one case (Item 9 of the agenda) the reporter had agreed with the CNPA's assessment of significant negative landscape impacts and that in the other case (a hut beside the river Tromie) they had reached a different conclusion on the scale and significance of landscape impacts. That difference of opinion on the impacts in the Tromie appeal had resulted in a different conclusion through applying the same policy tests. He advised that there wasn't anything that the CNPA could do to change that.

### **Agenda Item 11: Date of Next Meeting**

31. The date of the next meeting is Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2022 in person.

32. The public business of the meeting concluded at 11.04 hours.