

**The Highland Council  
Planning Review Body**

**17 March 2026, 2:00pm  
Minutes**

Listed below are the decisions taken by the Planning Review Body at their virtual meeting on 17 March 2026. The webcast of the meeting will be available within 48 hours of broadcast and will remain online for 12 months: <https://highland.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**Present:**

Mrs I Campbell (Remote)  
Mr D Fraser  
Mr R Gale  
Mr B Lobban  
Mr A Mackintosh  
Mr P Oldham  
Mrs M Paterson (Remote)

**In Attendance:**

Ms A Gibbs, Principal Solicitor  
Ms B Alexander, Solicitor  
Mr B Strachan, Independent Planning Adviser to the Planning Review Body  
Mrs O Bayon, Committee Officer

**Mr P Oldham in the Chair**

**Preliminaries**

The Chair confirmed that the meeting would be webcast and gave a short briefing on the Council's webcasting procedure and protocol.

**Business**

**1. Calling of the Roll and Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was intimated on behalf of Mr D Millar.

**2. Declarations of Interest/Transparency Statement**

There were no Declarations of Interest or Transparency Statements.

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

There had been circulated and **APPROVED** the Minutes of Meetings held on 27 January 2026.

**4. Criteria for Determination of Notices of Review**

The Clerk confirmed that, for all subsequent items on the agenda, Members had contained in their SharePoint all of the information supplied by all parties to the Notice

of Review – namely everything submitted at the planning application stage and the Notice of Review stage from the applicant and interested parties together with the case officer's report on handling and the decision notice that had been issued. When new information had been identified and responded to by the case officer, that information had also been included in SharePoint.

Members were reminded that when determining each planning application subject to a Notice of Review, they were to give full consideration of the planning application afresh (also known as the “de novo” approach) in accordance with the advice contained in the letter from the Chief Planner dated 29 July 2011. The Clerk confirmed that this meant that, in each Notice of Review case, the Review Body needed to assess the planning application against the development plan – including the recently adopted National Planning Framework 4 – and decide whether it accorded with or was contrary to the development plan. Following this assessment, the Review Body then required to consider all material considerations relevant to the application and decide whether these added to or outweighed their assessment of the application against the development plan. In carrying out this assessment, all documents lodged by the applicant and interested parties needed to be considered by the Review Body – all material planning considerations required to be taken into account; considerations that were not material planning considerations must not be taken into account.

The Clerk also confirmed that Google Earth and Street view could be used during the meeting in order to inform Members of the site location. Members were reminded of the potential limitations of using these systems in that images may have been captured a number of years ago and may not reflect the current position on the ground. All the Notices of Review were competent.

## 5. New Notices of Review to be Determined

### 5.1

**Ward:** 05 Wester Ross, Strathpeffer and Lochalsh

**Review Body Ref:** 25/00084/RBREF

**Applicant:** Orsay Crofting Services

**Location:** The Lodge at Orsay, Old Inn Croft, Blairminich, Strathpeffer

**Nature of Development:** Siting of mobile home unit (in retrospect), 24/02767/FUL

**Reason for Notice of Review:** Review Against Refusal

#### **Decision:-**

The Review Body **AGREED** to **DISMISS** the Notice of Review and refuse planning permission for the reasons contained in the report of handling as follows:

1. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 policies 17, 22, 29 and 30 and HWLDP policies 35, 44 and 64 as it has failed to demonstrate that the site is not at risk from flooding and is therefore unsuitable for the use proposed. SEPA's Flood Map shows that the application site lies partly inside the 1 in 200-year (flood extents of the River Peffery). The Highland Council has carried out detailed flood modelling of the River Peffery as part of the River Peffery Flood Protection Study. This work confirms that the majority of the plot and access is at risk of flooding in a 1 in 200 year plus climate change flood event. The development fails to accord with the principle of avoiding development on sites at risk of flooding and has failed to demonstrate that the site is suitable for the use proposed.

### 5.2

**Ward:** 05 Wester Ross, Strathpeffer and Lochalsh

**Review Body Ref:** 25/00090/RBREF

**Applicant:** Ms Jane Hickman

**Location:** Land 135M NE Of, The Lookout, Kishorn

**Nature of Development:** Erection of house, 25/00337/PIP

**Reason for Notice of Review:** Review Against Refusal

**Decision:-**

The Review Body **AGREED** to **UPHOLD** the Notice of Review and grant planning permission subject to conditions to be drafted by the Independent Planning Adviser to the Planning Review Body. Reasons given in support of upholding the Notice of Review:

The proposal is in accordance with NPF4 policies 17, 3 and 6 and HwLDP policies 36 and 51 for the following reasons:-

It supports and sustains an existing fragile community, is suitable in terms of location, access and environmental impact, is in accordance with the pattern of development in the area and does not lead to unacceptable build-up. Impacts on biodiversity and mature trees are considered to be acceptable.

**5.3**

**Ward:** 05 Wester Ross, Strathpeffer and Lochalsh

**Review Body Ref:** 25/00092/RBREF

**Applicant:** Ms Jane Hickman

**Location:** Land 125M NE Of, The Lookout, Kishorn

**Nature of Development:** Erection of house (Plot 2), 25/00335/PIP

**Reason for Notice of Review:** Review Against Refusal

A variety of views were discussed before the following motion and amendment was proposed and seconded.

Mr R Gale seconded by Mr A Mackintosh **MOVED** to uphold the Notice of Review and grant planning permission in principle subject to conditions to be drafted by the Independent Planning Adviser to the Planning Review Body. Reasons given in support of upholding the Notice of Review:

The proposal is in accordance with NPF4 policies 17, 3 and 6 and HwLDP policies 36 and 51 for the following reasons:-

It supports and sustains an existing fragile community, is suitable in terms of location, access and environmental impact, is in accordance with the pattern of development in the area and does not lead to an unacceptable build-up. Impacts on biodiversity and mature trees are considered to be acceptable.

As an Amendment, Mr P Oldham seconded by Mr B Lobban **MOVED** to dismiss the Notice of Review and refuse planning permission in principle for the reasons contained in the report of handling.

There being no further amendments, the matter was put to the vote with votes being cast as follows:

The **MOTION** received 2 votes, and the **AMENDMENT** received 5 votes, with no abstentions, and the **AMENDMENT** was therefore **CARRIED**, the votes having been cast as follows:

**For the Motion:**

Mr R Gale, Mr A Mackintosh

**For the Amendment:**

Mrs I Campbell, Mr D Fraser, Mr B Lobban, Mr P Oldham, Mrs M Paterson

**Decision:-**

The Review Body **AGREED** to **DISMISS** the Notice of Review and refuse planning permission for the reasons contained in the report of handling as follows:

1. The site is small and constrained by mature trees and development on this site would not be in accordance with the established pattern of the development in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to NPF4 policy 17 and HWLDP policy 36.
2. The cumulative impact of this development and other proposed development in the vicinity would lead to an unacceptable build up of development that would be out of keeping with the character of the area contrary to NPF4 policy 17 and HWLDP policy 36.
3. The development would adversely impact on mature trees and biodiversity value and as such is contrary to NPF4 policies 3 and 6 and HWLDP policy 51.

**5.4**

**Ward:** 20 Badenoch and Strathspey

**Review Body Ref:** 25/00091/RBREF

**Applicant:** Lindsay Sutherland

**Location:** 2 Creag A Ghreusaiche, Aviemore, PH22 1LD,

**Nature of Development:** Change of use to short term let, 25/02828/FUL

**Reason for Notice of Review:** Review Against Refusal

**Decision:-**

The Review Body **AGREED** to **UPHOLD** the Notice of Review and grant planning permission subject to conditions to be drafted by the Independent Planning Adviser to the Planning Review Body. Reasons given in support of upholding the Notice of Review:

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of Policy 30 of NPF4 as it does not have unacceptable impacts on amenity or the local character of the area.

**5.5**

**Ward:** 20 Badenoch And Strathspey

**Review Body Ref:** 25/00094/RBREF

**Applicant:** JLM Property Holdings Ltd

**Location:** Land 35M SW Of, 36 Seafield Place, Aviemore,

**Nature of Development:** Demolition of store and erection of house and garage, 25/00806/FUL

**Reason for Notice of Review:** Review Against Refusal

**Decision:-**

The Review Body **AGREED** to **DISMISS** the Notice of Review and refuse planning permission for the reasons contained in the report of handling as follows:

1. The proposals do not comply with Policy 14 of National Planning Framework 4, or Policy 3 of the Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan, in that they are considered to be overdevelopment of the site and therefore poorly designed; detrimental to the amenity of neighbours or the surrounding area; not sympathetic to the traditional pattern and character of the surrounding area; and do not provide appropriate levels of private amenity ground.

**5.6**

**Ward:** 20 Badenoch And Strathspey

**Review Body Ref:** 25/00096/RBREF

**Applicant:** Maxmeta

**Location:** 31 Caledonia Place, Aviemore, PH22 1NW,

**Nature of Development:** Change of use from house to short term let, 22/04048/FUL

**Reason for Notice of Review:** Review Against Refusal

**Decision:-**

The Review Body **AGREED** to **DISMISS** the Notice of Review and refuse planning permission for the following reason:

The proposal is contrary to Policy 30 NPF4. It is incompatible with the surrounding area in terms of the nature and scale of the activity and impacts of increased visitors. The impacts on local amenity and character of the area are unacceptable.

The meeting concluded at 4pm.