



**10 February 2026**

**MEDIA RELEASE**

**LOCH LOMOND AND THE TROSSACHS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY BOARD MEMBER  
SUSPENDED FOR BREACH OF CODE OF CONDUCT**

At a Hearing held in Balloch on 10 February 2026, the Standards Commission suspended, for six months, a board member of Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority, Mr Sid Perrie. This was after he was found to have breached the Park Authority Board Members' Code of Conduct.

Morag Ferguson, Standards Commission Member and Chair of the Hearing Panel, said: *"The Panel found that in a number of emails sent in August and September 2024, Mr Perrie was discourteous and disrespectful towards the Park Authority's Convener, other board members and its Chief Executive. The Panel further found that as Mr Perrie's emails were threatening, both in tone and content, towards the Convener and Chief Executive, his conduct in sending them also amounted to bullying"*.

The Panel found that, in the August emails, Mr Perrie was discourteous and disrespectful towards the Park Authority's Convener, other board members and its Chief Executive by making a number of serious accusations about them and the Park Authority's decision-making in relation to a major planning application. As examples, the Panel noted Mr Perrie accused the Convener of "undemocratic and unlawful" acts, of bullying him, of criminal activity, and of going "way beyond her authority". He accused the Chief Executive of exceeding his powers, "having produced a masterpiece in half-truths, evasions, fallacies and obfuscation" and of "misconduct in public office".

The Panel found the tone of all Mr Perrie's emails to be aggressive and discourteous, and entirely inappropriate for a member of a board of a public body. The Panel was particularly disappointed to note that one email, Mr Perrie stated that the Convener should "have a frank conversation" with her husband about her best interests and should get herself a lawyer. Given the Convener's husband was neither a member, nor an employee, of the Park Authority and, indeed, had no ostensible connection to the matter, the Panel considered Mr Perrie's conduct in doing so to be condescending, spurious and entirely discourteous. The Panel was satisfied it was unlikely Mr Perrie would have made any such mention of a spouse, had the Convener not been female.

The Panel also found that by challenging the decision by the Park Authority to proceed to make a determination on the planning application, both publicly and in the disparaging manner in which he had, Mr Perrie breached the requirement in the Code to abide by the principle of collective responsibility. In addition, the Panel found that, in an email sent in August 2024, Mr Perrie disclosed to a number of external recipients, the personal or private email addresses of other board members, none of which were readily available publicly. The Panel found that, in doing so, he breached the requirement in the Code that requires Board Members to refrain from disclosing confidential information.

In determining the sanction to be imposed, the Panel acknowledged that Mr Perrie was entitled to raise concerns he may have had about the Park Authority's decision-making. It considered, however,

that he could have done so in a respectful manner, either at a board meeting or in private with the Convener and Chief Executive, without breaching the Code.

The Panel considered the breaches of the Code were serious in nature. While it noted, in mitigation, there had not been any previous findings of a contravention of the Code by Mr Perrie, it was concerned he had not demonstrated any insight whatsoever into the potential impact of his conduct on others, either on a personal level, or in terms of how it made them feel when working for, or engaging with the Park Authority. Indeed, the Panel noted that Mr Perrie appeared to be concerned only with his own views.

The Panel further noted Mr Perrie had not proffered any apology. It was dismayed to note that, instead, Mr Perrie (through those representing him) had repeated his accusations during the ESC's investigation and, further, following the referral to the Standards Commission, had attempted to publicly undermine the Hearing process.

In the circumstances, the Panel concluded that a six-month suspension was an appropriate sanction. Mrs Ferguson stated: *"The requirements for board members to treat everyone with whom they come into contact in their capacity as elected members with respect, and to refrain from any conduct that could amount to bullying or harassment, are key provisions of a public body's Code. The Panel noted that a failure to comply with the Code's provisions in this regard can adversely affect the rights and reputations of others. It also has a detrimental effect on how a public body's business is conducted and decisions are made which, in turn, erodes public confidence in the public body itself."*

A full written decision of the Hearing will be issued and published on the Standards Commission's website within 14 days.

ENDS

## NOTES FOR EDITORS

1. Complaints about councillors are made to the Ethical Standards Commissioner (ESC). The Standards Commission and ESC are separate and independent, each with distinct functions. The ESC is responsible for investigating complaints. Following investigation, the ESC will refer its report to the Standards Commission for Scotland for adjudication. Email: [info@ethicalstandards.org.uk](mailto:info@ethicalstandards.org.uk), <https://www.ethicalstandards.org.uk/>  
Tel: 0300 011 0550
2. The [Standards Commission for Scotland](#) is an independent public body, responsible for encouraging high standards of behaviour by councillors and those appointed to boards of devolved public bodies including in education, environment, health, culture, transport, and justice. The role of the Standards Commission is to encourage high ethical standards in public life; promote and enforce the Codes of Conduct; issue guidance to councils and devolved public bodies and adjudicate on alleged breaches of the Codes of Conduct, applying sanctions where a breach is found.
3. The Codes of Conduct outline the standards of conduct expected of councillors and members of devolved public bodies. The Park Authority's Code of Conduct is based on a [Model Code of Conduct](#) issued by Scottish Ministers, with the approval of the Parliament.