



# Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting

**Held at Cairngorms National Park Authority office, Grantown-on-Spey**

**Hybrid**

**29 August 2025 at 11.00am**

## **Present in person**

Russell Jones (Convener)  
Sandy Bremner  
Kenny Deans  
Lauren MacCallum  
Derek Ross

Paul Gibb (Deputy Convener)  
Dr Peter Cosgrove  
John Kirk  
Eleanor Mackintosh  
Michael Williamson

## **Virtual**

Geva Blackett  
Dr Hannah Grist  
Dr Fiona McLean  
Ann Ross

Jackie Brierton  
Bill Lobban  
Duncan Miller

## **Apologies**

Steve Micklewright

## **In Attendance**

Gavin Miles, Director of Planning and Place  
David Berry, Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer  
Peter Ferguson, Harper MacLeod LLP  
Emma Bryce, Planning Manager (Development Manager)  
Colin Bryans, Senior Planning Officer, Development Management  
Katherine Donnachie, Planning Officer, Development Management  
Katie Crerar, Planning Officer (Development Management)



Scott Shanks, Ecology Adviser  
Dee Straw, Planning Administrator and Systems Officer  
Laquarn Rose, Graduate Planner  
Emma Greenlees, Planning Systems Support  
Alix Harkness, Clerk to the Board  
David Cameron, Deputy CEO and Director of Corporate Services

## **Agenda Item 1**

### **Welcome and apologies**

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

## **Agenda Items 2 and 3**

### **Approval of minutes of previous meetings and Matters arising**

2. The minutes of the previous meeting on 13 June 2025 held at Cairngorms National Park Authority, Grantown on Spey, were approved with no amendments.
3. David Berry, Chief Planning Officer and Head of Planning provided an update on action points arising from the minutes of 13 June 2025:
  - a) At Para 11 i) – add advisory note on construction timing and noise and discuss local provenance requirements for wildflower planting with applicant (both actioned)
  - b) At Para 27i) – link to SSEN consultation to be circulated to the Committee (actioned)
4. The minutes of the previous meeting on 27 June 2025 held In the Albert Hall, Ballater were approved with no amendments.

## **Agenda Item 4**

### **Declarations of interest**

5. Bill Lobban declared an Interest in Items 6 and 7 as he has a history of previous comments on applications within this site and would leave the meeting for the duration of the discussion of those items.



6. Dr Pete Cosgrove declared an Interest in Items 8 and 12 as he and his company (Alba Ecology) have undertaken ecological surveys and provided ecological advice in relation to these applications and so would leave the meeting for the duration of those items.
7. Bill Loban declared an Interest in Items 10, 11 and 12 as they are still to be discussed by Highland Council Planning Committee. He advised he would not take part in discussions today and was awaiting collective responsibility clarification from standards commission.
8. Russell Jones declared an Interest in Items 10, 11 and 12 as they are still to be discussed by Highland Council Planning Committee. He advised he would take part in discussions today but at Highland Council Planning Committee he would have to declare an Interest and exclude himself from those discussions.
9. Derek Ross declared an interest in Items 10, 11 and 12 as he has previously made comments in national press about the cumulative effect and impact of wind farms on the landscape.
10. Lauren MacCallum declared an interest in Item 5 as she has been a local resident and may be a future resident near the site, however as this is not yet confirmed she advised that she remain present and take part in discussions on this item.

## **Agenda Item 5**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2024/0260/DET**

Demolition of building and erection of 6no. terraced houses, 2no. semi-detached houses and a block of 6no. flats

At 21 Morlich Court, Aviemore, PH22 1SL

**Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions**

11. Colin Bryans, Senior Planning Officer presented the paper to the committee. He stated that, in addition to the recommended conditions in the committee report, a further condition to secure the affordable housing in perpetuity is recommended. He added that an Objector to the application could not come to today's meeting due to being offshore working. Instead, the Senior Planning Officer stated the Objector's main concerns relating to the application:
  - a) the overbearing nature of the proposed structure
  - b) overlooking and overshadowing of their property



- c) negative impact on privacy and light
- d) noise levels and light pollution
- e) style and materials are not in keeping with wider character of existing houses

12. The Committee were invited to ask the Senior Planning Officer for clarity, and the following points were raised:

- a) Was only a single bin store being proposed for the entire development? Senior Planning Officer advised that the communal bins relate to the flats only.
- b) With regards to the design and materials, who makes the final decision on what is acceptable or not? Senior Planning Officer advised that the committee ultimately determine the application, and noted that the proposal was of a design which is relatively common across the Highlands.
- c) How many parking spaces would there be for visitors? Senior Planning Officer advised that it was the total parking spaces that had been assessed and complied with policy.
- d) Have the objectors seen the amended plans for the two semi-detached houses? Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the revised plans were in the public domain.

13. The agent's representatives Lauren McIntyre and Martin English addressed the committee.

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

- a) Could the effect of the proposed development on sun and shade be shown in more detail? Martin English showed the Committee a slide demonstrating that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties when compared with what currently exists.
- b) A member highlighted a concern around the air source heating units being close to windows, and the noise that would incur. Senior Planning Officer advised that he was satisfied it was acceptable.
- c) Concerns raised regarding the colours being used, was a different palette tried and why was this one chosen? Martin English explained the design approach, noted that it took account of the experience of developments elsewhere, and that quality materials would be used. Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer added that recommended condition 2 requires approval of the sample of final materials prior to development. Several members expressed the view



that a lighter colour palate would be beneficial and would like the developer to take that on board when seeking approval for final materials, although others considered it to be appropriate as proposed.

- d) A member asked for more information around the links to local amenities and was it easy to move around the site? The Planning officer explained that the existing links to Grampian Road were being retained. The Applicant was retaining existing links but because of tree preservation orders they cannot upgrade the paths.
- e) A member raised concerns of putting up bird boxes on site, and described mitigation measures off site would be more beneficial. Planning Officer confirmed the internal Ecology officer had made similar comments about the detailed siting of the proposed boxes, and that a condition was therefore recommended to secure approval of the final details.
- f) Comment made around the traffic on Grampian Road was increasing, planning for active travel routes, a considerable amount of noise pollution which would impact on residents.
- g) Praise for the 100% affordability of the development.
- h) A member put forward an amendment quoting LDP policy 3.3 objecting to the application on the grounds of the proximity of the two proposed semi-detached houses to existing nearby properties. The amendment was unsupported.
- i) A member questioned why there were no details pertaining to the proposed solar panels? Martin English advised that this is required under building regulations, and the final details would be confirmed at building control stage. Solar panels on the plans were indicative, and each property would benefit from solar panels.

15. The Committee approved the application as per the officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions detailed in the report and to include the additional condition to secure the affordability of the properties in perpetuity.

16. Action Point arising: None.

Bill Lobban left the room at 12.08 pm

Dr Peter Cosgrove left the meeting at 12.08 pm



## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2025/0083/DET**

Erection of 2no. houses on Plots 58 (58A and B)

At 34 Farm Road, Aviemore, PH22 1AP

**Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions**

17. Colin Bryans, Senior Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.

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

- a) Could it be explained why the affordable housing contributions were going to be sought through a commuted sum rather than providing affordable housing on site? Senior Planning Officer explained that this was a standalone application for two houses which falls below the normal policy requirement for an affordable housing contribution. However, as this proposal adds an additional unit to the wider Dalfaber site, it was felt that a commuted sum was the most appropriate way to capture an affordable housing contribution.

19. The Committee were invited to discuss the report. The following point was raised:

- a) Comment made that they were happy to see two houses being proposed instead of one big house.

20. The Committee approved the application subject to the conditions stated in the report and a legal agreement to secure the affordable housing commuted sum.

21. Action Points arising:                      None.

## **Agenda Item 7**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2025/0112/DET**

Reconfiguration of two-house plots to form three plots and erection of three houses

At Land 52M SW of 16 Farm Road, Aviemore

**Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions**

22. Colin Bryans, Senior Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.

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



- a) What were the implications for the longer term, would the proposed change of houses in this application and the previous application affect the total number of houses on the wider site? Was there a point where the services such as the water supply would not cope or the school roll too full? Planning Officer advised that for the increase of a single unit or two, that point would not be reached
- b) A member advised that the five bed houses have proved difficult to sell and smaller houses was what the community needed.

24. The Committee approved the application subject to the conditions stated in the report and a legal agreement to secure the affordable housing commuted sum.

25. Action Points arising:                      None.

Bill Lobban returned to the room at 12.26 pm

## **Agenda Item 8**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2025/0104/DET**

Realignment of 400m of River Tromie

At Land 670M NW of Dell of Killiehuntly Farmhouse, Kingussie

**Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions**

26. Katherine Donnachie, Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the committee. A late representation from the Cairngorms Crofters & Farmers Community had been received their main points were:
- a) They object to the scheme on the grounds that it will affect the viability of Invertromie Farm and may increase flood risk to steading buildings that have been converted to residential use
  - b) They suggest an alternative approach involving removing gravel and deepening the existing river channel to divert water away from the present breach into the Dell of Killiehuntly meadows.
27. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer for clarity, and the following points were raised:
- a) A member queried the 90 degrees turn in the proposed new channel and asked how it would work? He raised concerns about whether the river would follow the proposed new channel when in spate and whether this could upset



the validity of the riverbank. Planning Officer explained that the development would involve putting in a lateral bar on the river, and if it were to go down original route at some times that would not necessarily be a bad outcome.

- b) Concern raised about the development how it would help to prevent flooding.
- c) A member asked where the new channel is proposed, was that land currently being used for grazing and then will it cease to be used for grazing. Planning Officer explained that part of it was being used by grazing. Member added he had experience of grazing on similar grounds and would be concerned about livestock becoming trapped in water behind them.

28. The Convener proposed a motion that a site visit take should take place prior to this item being determined by the Committee. This was seconded by John Kirk.

29. The Committee proceeded to a vote. The results were as follows:

	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Geva Blackett	X		
Sandy Bremner			X
Jackie Brierton	X		
Kenny Deans	X		
Paul Gibb	X		
Russell Jones	X		
John Kirk	X		
Bill Lobban	X		
Lauren MacCallum			X
Eleanor Mackintosh	X		
Fiona McLean		X	
Duncan Miller	X		
Ann Ross	X		
Derek Ross	X		
Michael Williamson	X		
<b>TOTAL</b>	12	1	2





30. The Committee agreed that this application be DEFERRED to the next meeting on 14 November 2025 allowing for a site visit to have taken place beforehand.

31. Action Point arising:

- i. Site visit to be arranged prior to next Committee meeting.**

Break for lunch at 12.56 pm

Hannah Grist joined the meeting at 1.46 pm

Meeting resumed at 1.46pm

## **Agenda Item 9**

### **Application for Detailed Planning Permission 2025/0077/DET**

Upgrade of track for forestry (in retrospect)

At Land NW of Clachbain, Dulhain Bridge, Grantown-on-Spey

**Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions**

32. Katie Crerar, Planning Officer, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.

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

- a) A member questioned the use of a twin wall and potential fire risk. Planning Officer advised that the Applicant could talk about that, however they would be following NatureScot guidance.
- b) Concern raised that there did not appear to be passing places for vehicles proposed and concern with the width of the track. Planning Officer advised that there was a proposed turning area at the top, which would be retained as proved useful during the recent fire.
- c) A member queried the retrospective nature of the application. Planning Officer confirmed it was partially retrospective. Member reiterated that significant development had taken place as could be seen from the photos on the slides.

34. The agent Caroline Webster addressed the committee.



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

- a) With reference to condition 3, the treatment planting on the verge would they consider the use of hydro seeding? Caroline Webster confirmed she would be happy to consider that.
- b) Had the work been carried out in house? Caroline Webster advised that a contractor was brought in and her understanding was that the same contractor would be used to complete the development.
- c) Would materials be brought in to stabilise the hill as was concerned the clay would wash away? Caroline Webster advised that the guidance is to use local materials, which will be sourced from a borrow pit.

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

- a) Comments were made about that the current poor state of the site.
- b) Committee agreed that a letter be sent to the applicant expressing the Committee's disappointment about the retrospective nature of the application.

37. The Committee approved the application as per the officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

38. Action Point arising:

- i. **Planning Committee Convener to write a letter to the applicant expressing the Committee's disappointment about the retrospective nature of the application.**

Derek Ross left the room at 14.11

Bill Lobban left the room at 14.11

Peter Ferguson left the room at 14.11

Katie Crerar left the meeting at 14.11

## Agenda Item 10

For decision

Balnespick (ECU00004904) (CNPA ref 2025/0040/PAC)

**Recommendation:** Objection

39. Emma Bryce, Planning Manager, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.

40. The Committee were invited to ask for clarity, and the following point was raised:



- a) A member queried the process, should the Committee object to it, would this trigger a public inquiry? Director of Planning and Place advised that an objection from the Park Authority would not trigger a public inquiry, but if NatureScot object that would likely be the case. The member asked if the Park Authority would be subjected to the legal cost of this? Director of Planning and Place confirmed that NatureScot would lead on providing evidence to any inquiry and we would support them as required.

41. The Committee were invited to discuss the report. The following point was raised:

- a) A member commented that he wholeheartedly supported the planning manager's recommendation.

42. The Committee agreed to **Object** to this application.

43. Action Points arising:               None.

Peter Ferguson returned to the room at 2.22 pm

Pete Cosgrove returned to the meeting at 2.23 pm

## Agenda Item 11

For decision

Clune Windfarm (ECU00005038) (CNPA ref 2025/0047/PAC)

**Recommendation:** Objection

44. Emma Bryce, Planning Manager, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.

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

- a) Member stated that as in the item before NatureScot have set out objections clearly
- b) Concur with officer's recommendations given the major impact on landscape quality this development, if consented, would bring.

46. The Committee agreed to **Object** to this application.

47. Action Points arising:               None.



Peter Cosgrove left the room at 2.30 pm

## Agenda Item 12

For decision

Highland Windfarm (ECU00005082) (CNPA ref 2025/0080/PAC)

**Recommendation:** Objection

48. Emma Bryce, Planning Manager, Development Management presented the paper to the committee.

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

- a) Members queried why the recommendation was to object to the windfarm yet not object to the track which would serve it? Planning Manager explained that the track exists, and if this was a standalone application for the track works, there would be no grounds to object to it, we would be looking to ensure mitigation and reinstatement.
- b) Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer advised that the vast majority of the windfarm application was out with the National Park, whereas part of the track element was within. The report therefore dealt with the track element separately, as it had to be assessed against the policies in the Local Development Plan, whereas those policies could not be applied to the rest of the windfarm. However, it was not envisaged that the Park Authority would submit separate responses to the consultation.
- c) Peter Ferguson, Legal Advisor further clarified that as the consultation is on one application, procedurally the Park Authority should either object or not object to the development as a whole, and the reasons for doing so could be expressed.

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

- a) Agreed to Object to the entirety of the proposal.

51. The Committee agreed to **Object** to this application in its entirety,

52. Action Points arising:                      None.

Geva Blackett left the meeting at 2.50 pm

Derek Ross returned to the room at 2.50 pm



Bill Lobban returned to the room at 2.50 pm

Peter Cosgrove returned to the room at 2.50 pm

**Paused for a short comfort break at 2.50 pm**

David Cameron joined the meeting at 3 pm

Deirdre Straw joined the meeting at 3 pm

**Meeting reconvened at 3.02 pm**

## **Agenda Item 13**

For decision

Planning Committee Standing Orders

**Recommendation:** Approve

53. David Berry, Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer presented the paper to the committee.

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

- a) Format & Locations of meetings - a member asked if the provision of having hybrid meetings would remain? Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer confirmed that most meetings would continue to be in hybrid form.
- b) Site visits - A member asked how these would work for those with mobility issues, those who cannot step up on a certain height. Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer advised that site visits are not the norm and would be limited, he would work with the Clerks to address mobility issues. David Cameron, Director of Corporate Services and Deputy CEO added that for any outdoor trip a Risk Assessment would be undertaken, with the aim of ensuring accessibility of that site to all members.
- c) A member asked if using video or drones would be an option? Director of Corporate Services and Deputy CEO advised they could perhaps be used as a hybrid presentation tool, but the aim would be to design the risk assessment to allow all members to attend.
- d) Representations - a member asked what the new proposed cutoff date be? Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer advised that it would be extended to 21 days before date of the Committee meeting.

55. The Committee were invited to discuss the paper. The following points were raised:



### Format and locations of meetings

- a) a member felt it was important that the location of meetings changes and would suggest at least two meetings a year out and about.
- b) A member felt it was important to continue with hybrid meetings but not only when in Grantown - these should move around the National Park.
- c) A member commented that holding meetings elsewhere should depend on merit, where there were applications relevant to that area, and to have flexibility makes sense as per the recommendation.
- d) Another agreed but felt that hybrid options should be available at external venues and not just in Grantown. Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer advised that a hybrid option could not be guaranteed in all external venues out with Grantown due to issues with broadband.
- e) The Convener agreed that he would like to see the Committee meetings taking place more around the National Park, that he understood the difficulties with hybrid availability in locations outside Grantown, and summarised that the Committee agreed to the recommendation on format and location of meetings as set out in the paper.

### Site visits

- f) A member expressed their concerns with regards to accessibility. Director of Planning and Place advised that for site visits staff try to design with as little walking as possible and would be happy to continue to do that. He added that site visits should not be a barrier for anyone.
- g) Local authority nominees discussed which of their perspective local authorities deem site visits mandatory.
- h) A member advised that accessibility does not only mean difficulty with walking but can also mean having mobility issues such as having trouble getting in and out high sided vehicles.
- i) A member commented that it could be off putting for new board members in the future joining the board due to issues with accessibility.
- j) A member questioned what would happen if people couldn't attend because of snow and the meeting was not quorate.
- k) A member said that site visit does help inform views on application, gives those putting in applications reassurance. Should be mandatory if officer recommends that there should be one.



56. Eleanor Mackintosh proposed an amendment that there should not be a two-tiered system for site visits as proposed in the report. This was seconded by Paul Gibb. This proceeded into a vote, the results were as follows:

	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Sandy Bremner		X	
Jackie Brierton		X	
Peter Cosgrove		X	
Kenny Deans		X	
Paul Gibb		X	
Hannah Grist		X	
Russell Jones		X	
John Kirk		X	
Bill Lobban		X	
Lauren MacCallum		X	
Eleanor Mackintosh		X	
Fiona McLean		X	
Duncan Miller		X	
Ann Ross			X
Derek Ross		X	
Michael Williamson		X	
<b>TOTAL</b>		15	1

57. The second vote followed on whether site visits should be made mandatory or remain optional; the results were as follows:

	MANDATORY	OPTIONAL	ABSTAIN
Sandy Bremner	X		
Jackie Brierton	X		
Peter Cosgrove	X		



Kenny Deans	X		
Paul Gibb	X		
Hannah Grist		X	
Russell Jones	X		
John Kirk	X		
Bill Lobban	X		
Lauren MacCallum	X		
Eleanor Mackintosh		X	
Fiona McLean		X	
Duncan Miller	X		
Ann Ross		X	
Derek Ross	X		
Michael Williamson		X	
<b>TOTAL</b>	11	5	

58. The Committee agreed the revised Planning Committee Standing Orders with the caveat that all site visits would be mandatory going forward. The Planning Committee agreed the revised standing orders would be presented to the Board at their next meeting for formal ratification.

59. Action Point arising:

- i. **Amendments to Planning Committee Standing Orders to be made prior to presentation to the Board.**

David Cameron left the meeting at 4.12 pm

## **AOCB**

60. David Berry, Head of Planning and Chief Planning Officer gave the following updates:

- a) House of Bruar planning application - Scottish Ministers were notified of the Park Authority's intention to approve this application after planning committee on 13 June. Ministers subsequently confirmed that they would not





call in it and gave clearance to issue the planning permission, which has now been done.

- b) Laurel Bank planning application - This application was called in by Scottish Ministers in 2023. Their decision has now been received, and they intend to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a legal agreement to secure a contribution towards active travel improvements. Officers are currently working with the applicant to agree a fair and reasonable contribution. Subject to us being able to conclude an appropriate agreement, Scottish Ministers will issue the planning permission.

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

### **Date of next meeting**

62. The public business of the meeting concluded at 4.15 pm

63. Date of next meeting 14 November 2025