

Section 2: Analysis of the full written responses

- 2-1 This section of the report summarises the views we received from people who wrote letters and submitted reports.
- 2-2 Table 2-1 lists all those individuals and organisations who submitted full written responses during the consultation period, broken down by the categories listed in Table 1-1, para 1-4. Table 2-2 shows the number of responses falling into each group. We recognise that the coding process we have undertaken may not be entirely accurate (for example not all respondents indicated an affiliation while other responses did not fit easily into any one category). However, we believe that it has allowed for a more detailed assessment of support for or opposition against particular aspects of the proposal.
- 2-3 Table 2-3 is a long table which shows the main issues arising in the responses on each of the key issues from the consultation document. Each issue is illustrated by a number of quotes from selected responses. The sequence of the responses set out in Table 2-3 follows the structure of the questions listed in Section 4 of the consultation document. In addition, a number of tables deal with other comments generated during the consultation - on aspects of the National Park and its management, on the direct elections to the Park Board, on the consultation process and on the potential costs of the National Park. The first column of each table provides a statement of the main sub-themes that emerged on any particular issue. This is followed by a listing of the code of respondents who made this comment, sorted by their origin. The final column provides some sample quotations from the responses to illuminate the points being made. Inevitably, this presentation cannot be expected to be totally comprehensive, since different respondents gave different degrees of emphasis to different points. However, it does aim to provide a fair indication of the relative number, type of respondents and location of respondents who commented on each of these sub issues.
- 2-4 In our consultation document we stated that all written submissions would be available for others to see unless otherwise requested by the respondent. Of the 349 full written responses we received, only one individual and one organisation made such a request. The views expressed by these consultees are therefore not incorporated into the analysis presented in Table 2-3.

Table 2-1: Individuals and organisations who submitted full written responses, listed by stakeholder group

A: Individuals and households (Total 209)

Response code	Geographic Origin	Respondee	Response code	Geographic Origin	Respondee
A3	X1	Mr E Stuart	A4	X4	Mr M Hall
A6	X5	Mr W McCallum	A8	X5	Mr A MacCaluim
A10	X5	Ms G Knapman	A11	X1	Ms B Dowling
A14	X5	Mr W McLeod	A15	X3	Mr H Maclean
A16	6Z	Mr M Murchison	A17	X5	Mr R Turnbull
A19	X2	Mr K McMahan	A20	X4	Dr A Watson
A22	X2	Mr K Tainsh	A24	X5	Dr S Bardwell
A25	X5	Mr P Imperiale	A26	X3	Mr M Stansfeld
A29	X4	Mr J Reith	A30	X3	Mr A Comerford
A34	4Z	Mr N Boyd	A35	X5	Ms I Main
A37	X4	Mr S Connor	A40	X4	Mr D Murray
A43	Y3	Mr A Wright	A44	X4	Dr J Balfour
A45	Y3	Mr J Hunt	A47	Y3	Ms L Grimshaw
A49	X3	Mr R Barton	A52	Y3	Mr D Sime
A53	X4	Ms S Brinkley	A55	X1	Mr E Langmuir
A57	X5	Mr C Dickinson	A58	X3	Mr B Robertson
A59	X5	Mr D Mackay	A61	Y4	Mr A Lugewie
A63	X5	Mr L Fraser	A64	X1	Mr H Johnson
A65	X4	Mr M Fleming	A67	X1	Mr J Montgomery
A69	X1	Sir T Macpherson	A72	X1	Mr R Searle
A76	X1	Ms J Gilliat	A78	X1	Sir E Peck
A79	X4	Mr C Munro	A82	X1	Mrs S Potter
A83	X5	Lieutenant Colonel Gordon	A84	X5	Mr T Fleming
A85	X1	Mr R Green	A87	X5	Mr N Gordon
A88	X5	Miss M Paynter	A89	X5	Mr M Slessor
A90	X5	Mr N Thomson	A91	X4	Mr N MacKenzie
A94	Y2	Mr J Allen	A95	X2	Mr I Smith
A97	X1	Messrs P Thomson & Bruce	A98	X4	Mr R Moss
A99	X4	Dr M Bell	A101	X4	Mr G Munro
A103	X1	Mr K McKay	A108	X4	Mr M Payne
A109	X1	Mr G Hall	A110	X1	Mr D Bethell
A113	X4	Dr Neil Raitt	A116	X5	Mr R Duff
A115	X4	Mr C Brown	A117	X5	Mr L Gardiner
A119	X5	Prof. J Smyth	A120	X5	Ms T Fredericks
A121	X5	Dr W Edgar	A122	X2	Mr W Horton
A124	X5	Mr K Smith	A128	X5	Mr S Bain
A130	X1	Miss C Fraser	A131	X5	Mr R James
A134	X5	Mr W Munro	A135	Y4	Mr T Hardy
A137	Y4	Mr J Richardson	A139	X4	Mr A Cruickshank
A141	X1	Mrs J Stevenson	A148	X3	Mr R Stirling Aird
A150	Y4	Prof. A Phillips	A155	X4	Mr W McDermott
A159	X5	Mr A Graham	A160	X5	Mr I Provan
A162	X5	Mr R Downing	A163	X3	Mr G Dilworth
A164	X5	Mr T Dawson	A172	X1	Mr D Cameron
A173	X1	Ms M Tindall	A174	Y4	Ms C Young

A178	x1	Dr T Fallowfield		A179	Y4	Mr D Shepherd
A180	X1	Mr G Gerrard		A183	X5	Mr G Stewart
A185	X4	Mr M Barnacle		A186	X4	Ms J O'Donovan
A187	X5	Mr T Rose		A198	x4	Mr J Foster
A200	X4	Dr J Jennings		A205	X4	Lord Wilson Of Tillyorn
A206	X5	Dr I Glen		A210	X2	Mr C Townsend
A211	X4	Mr K Mathieson		A213	X1	Ms M Burrows Smith
A215	X4	Mr I Keillar		A217	Y2	Mr E Emmett
A219	X2	Ms A Maclean		A220	X4	Mr R Maclean
A225	X1	Ms I Miller		A227	X4	Mr D Amory
A228	X4	Mr R Anderson		A229	X1	Mr C Carter
A231	Y4	Mr J Poulter		A232	X5	Mr S McIntosh
A233	X5	Mr J Parkinson		A234	X4	Mr C Macpherson
A236	X2	Mrs J Farquhar		A237	X4	Mr T Fletcher
A238	X4	Mr P Stirling Aird		A240	X4	Mr N Boss
A242	X1	Mrs B Barnes		A243	Y4	Mr D Oldfield
A244	Y4	Mr G Vincent		A245	X5	Mr D Standring
A247	X4	Mr D Jamieston		A249	Y4	Mr R Shaw
A250	X5	Mr A Langlands		A251	X5	Mr D Bethell
A253	X3	Ms K Dale		A257	Y4	Mr P Wightman
A259	X1	Mr J Gunn		A262	Y4	Mr G Smith
A263	X5	Mr G Gower		A265	X4	Mr D Broadhead
A266	X5	Mr W Aitken		A267	X2	Mrs M Porter
A270	X5	Mr T Viveash		A271	X2	Mr J Dinnes
A272	X3	Mr M Humphrey		A273	X3	Mrs S Ross
A274	X4	Mr I Butterfield		A275	X5	Mr R Evans
A277	X4	Dr P Tilbrook		A278	X1	Ms J Davidson
A280	X4	Ms E Woodward		A281	Y4	Miss J Cooke
A282	Y4	Ms S Langdon		A283	X4	Mr K Miller
A284	X4	Mr A Cram		A285	X5	Mrs V Griffiths
A293	X5	Mr R Craig		A295	X4	Mrs S Swan
A296	X5	Mr W Brooker		A297	X5	Mr R Carlaw
A298	X4	Mr R Davidson		A305	X5	Mr K Cooper
A308	X4	Mr I Hamilton		A310	Y4	Mr M Lewis
A312	X2	Mr B Morgan		A314	X3	Ms J Finlayson
A315	X1	Mr R Lennon		A317	X1	Mr P Diender
A318	X5	Mr R Goodier		A319	X1	Mr J Philp
A320	X4	Mr R Callander		A322	X3	Mr H Maclean
A325	X5	Mr R Chapman		A328	X4	Mr J Picken
A329	X1	Mr R Turnbull		A332	X4	Ms S Evans
A333	X1	Mr K Peters		A335	X5	Ms E Rowell
A336	Y3	Mr Garland		A338	X3	Mr D Mason
A339	Y4	Mr O Wallis		A340	X4	Mr F Dougherty
A342	X3	Mr A Loder		A346	X5	Mr D Jamieson
A347	X5	Ms F Murdoch		A350	Y4	Mr T Haynes
A351	X4	Mrs K Summers		A355	X1	Ms H Burrows Smith
A358	X5	Mr J King		A359	X4	Ms D Will
A362	X4	Mrs A Buick		A363	X4	Mr A Ramsey
A364	X4	Mr G Miller		A365	X1	Mr J Davison
A367	X4	Mrs D Kennard		A368	X5	In Confidence
A369	X5	Dr P Bullough		A370	X1	Mr A Buxton

A371	X4	Ms J Mathews		A374	X5	Ms M Tiso
A375	X5	Mr D Tiso		A377	X5	Dr T Isles
A379	X5	Mr I White		A380	Y4	Mr A Buck
A382	X1	Mrs K Watson		A383	X5	Mrs E Hay
A386	Y4	Ms C Gunn		A387	X5	Mr D Thomas
A390	X3	Mr T Buyers		A391	X4	Mr W Towers
A392	Y4	Ms J Blumli		A394	X1	Mrs A Angus
A398	X5	Mr L Gardiner		A400	X5	Mr A Fletcher
A401	Y4	Mr I Thow				

B: Individual landowners/managers/factors (Total 20)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
B1	X1	Mr F Tuck		B48	X3	Mr H Cochrane (Balfour Estate)
B62	X2	Mr P Thompson (Ben Alder Estate)		B77	Y3	Mr J Barr (The MacRoberts Trusts)
B138	X3	Mr A Bradford (Kincardine Estate)		B140	X3	Mr I De Sales La Terriere (Dunalastair Estate)
B143	X2	Mr B Wootton (Atholl Estates)		B146	Y2	Mr A Lewis (Seafield Estate)
B167	X1	Mr M Nicolson (Mar Estate)		B193	X4	Mr R Graham Campbell (Finlayson Hughes)
B223	X2	Mr M Nicol (Ballogie Estate)		B279	X2	Mr C Slimon (Breakachy)
B288	Y2	Mr D Leslie (Scottish Woodlands Ltd)		B323	Y1	Mr D Cook (Defence Estates)
B324	X2	Mr R Cooke (Dalhousie Estate)		B337	X1	Mr J Williamson (Alvie & Dalraddy Estates)
B348	X1	Mr J Grant (Rothiemurchus Estate)		B357	X4	Mrs K Macleod (Glen Gloy Estate)
B396	X3	Hon C Pearson (Dunecht Estates)		B402	X1	Mr J Kirk (Rothiemoon Farm)

C: Individual companies and businesses (Total 19)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
C36	Y3	Seebirds		C51	Y3	Ulva House Hotel
C71	Y4	Islands and Highlands Environmental Consultancy		C75	Y2	MI Drilling Fluids
C81	X5	Rae Environmental Consultant		C92	Y2	The Malt Distillers Association of Scotland Fluids
C142	X3	The Ross Partnership		C153	Y2	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd
C207	Y3	James Barr Consultants		C209	Y2	The Lodge
C258	X3	The Green Park Hotel		C276	Y2	The Cairngorm Reindeer Centre

C306	Y1	Timber Growers' Association		C309	Y2	Newtonmore Craft Centre
C353	Y2	Cairngorm Mountain Sports		C360	Y3	Lantra
C361	Y2	Rosegrove Guest House		C378	Y3	Tiso's
C397	Y3	AG Stark, Planning Policy Consultant				

D: Community Councils and Associations (Total 15) N.B. These responses were submitted in addition to the reports received as part of the community consultation exercise.

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
D46	Y3	Sandbank Community Council		D96	X1	Ballater and Crathie Community Council
D118	Y3	Tap O' Noth Community Council		D129	X2	Mid-Atholl Strathtay and Grandtully Community Council
D169	Y2	Grantown on Spey Community Council		D181	Y2	Pitlochry and Moulin Community Council
D188	Y2	Braemar Community Council		D191	Y2	Carr-Bridge and Vicinity Community Council
D195	Y3	Cabrach and Mortlach Community Association		D202	Y2	The Speyside Council
D290	X4	Kenmore and District Community Council		D303	Y3	Drumoak & Durris Community Council
D327	Y2	Newtonmore and Vicinity Community Council		D354	X4	Inveresk Community Council
D376	Y2	Birse Community Trust				

E: Local authorities (Total 8)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
E74	Y3	The City of Edinburgh Council		E80	Y2	Perth and Kinross Council
E104	Y2	The Highland Council		E123	Y2	The Moray Council
E126	Y2	Angus Council		E145	Y3	Dundee City Council
E246	Y3	Aberdeen City Council		E399	Y2	Aberdeenshire Council

F: MSP/MP/Local councillors (Total 2)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
F230	X2	Cllr B Dunlop (The Highland Council)		F381	X3	Cllr B Luffman (Aberdeenshire Council)

G: National agencies (Total 6)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
G32	Y4	English Nature		G86	Y1	Forestry Commission
G125	Y1	VisitScotland / Scottish Tourist Board		G157	Y2	Crown Estate
G199	Y1	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		G404	Y1	In confidence

H: Regional/local public agencies (Total 10)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
H13	Y3	East of Scotland Water		H28	Y1	West of Scotland Water
H31	Y2	Perthshire Tourist Board		H54	Y2	Aberdeen and Grampian Tourist Board
H106	Y2	North of Scotland Water Authority		H171	Y2	Scottish Enterprise Tayside
H252	Y2	Angus and Dundee Tourist Board		H343	Y2	Highlands of Scotland Tourist Board
H344	Y2	Highlands and Islands Enterprise		H136	Y2	Scottish Enterprise Grampian

J: Land management (Total 22)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
J70	Y1	Deer Commission For Scotland		J73	Y2	Scottish Countryside Rangers' Association
J93	Y2	The Woodland Trust		J102	Y2	Speyside Way Management Group
J114	Y3	Cairnhead Community Forest Trust		J152	Y1	British Association of Shooting and Conservation
J166	Y2	Cairngorms Partnership Agricultural Forum		J168	Y1	Royal Scottish Forestry Society
J201	Y1	The Game Conservancy Trust		J208	Y1	Scottish Landowners' Federation
J216	Y2	Angus Glens Sheep Health Association		J224	Y2	Invercauld Estate
J241	Y2	The Dee District Salmon Fishery Board		J261	Y2	Spey Fishery Board
J287	Y2	Knockando Estates		J307	Y2	Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board

J313	Y1	Scottish Gamekeepers' Association		J330	Y3	Freshwater Laboratory
J331	Y2	East Grampian Deer Management Group		J352	Y1	The Crofters' Commission
J356	Y2	Farm and Wildlife Advisory Group		J403	Y1	National Farmers' Union of Scotland

K: Natural and Cultural Heritage (Total 39)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
K5	Y1	Foundation for Endangered Languages		K9	Y3	Celtic League
K18	Y1	Comunn na Gaidhlig (National Gaelic Development Agency)		K21	Y3	Department of Celtic
K33	Y3	C L I (Gaelic Speakers)		K42	Y3	Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland
K60	Y1	Scottish Civic Trust		K100	Y3	Tayside Raptor Group
K105	Y2	Pitlochry Civic Trust		K112	Y2	World Wildlife Fund Scotland
K127	Y1	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds		K132	Y3	North East of Scotland Raptor Study Group
K144	Y3	British Lichen Society		K147	Y3	Plantlife
K149	Y1	Scottish Council for National Parks		K151	Y1	Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
K154	Y1	Scottish Wildlife Trust		K158	Y1	Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland
K165	Y1	The National Trust for Scotland		K170	Y1	Reforestation Scotland
K184	Y2	The Cairngorms Campaign		K197	Y2	Friends of Ben Rinnes
K221	Y2	North East Mountain Trust		K222	Y2	Elgin Museum
K334	X4	Crannach Management Group		K235	Y3	The Scottish Sub-Committee of the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages
K239	Y1	The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland		K255	Y2	Scottish Environment Link
K264	Y1	Scottish Local History		K269	Y2	John Muir Trust
K299	X5	Botanical Society of the British Isles		K311	Y2	The Grantown Society

K341	Y2	Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group		K345	Y1	Council for National Parks
K366	Y1	Scottish Native Woodlands		K384	Y1	Scottish Wild Land Group
K385	Y3	The Royal Society of Edinburgh		K388	Y3	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology

L: Recreation and sporting interests (Total 24)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. origin	Respondee
L12	Y2	Lagganlia Centre for Outdoor Education		L27	Y2	Scottish Gliding Association
L39	Y2	Craggan Golf Course and Fishery		L41	Y2	Scottish Youth Hostels Association
L56	Y2	Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society		L111	Y2	Scottish Ski Club
L133	Y3	Scottish Mountaineering Trust		L156	Y4	Camping and Caravanning Club
L161	Y3	Glasgow Nordic Ski Club		L175	X5	Culter Hillwalking Club
L189	Y3	Perth Mountaineering Club		L196	Y3	Royal Yachting Association
L226	Y2	Mountain Bothies Association		L254		Cairngorms Partnership Recreation Forum
L260	Y2	The Cairngorm Club		L268	Y2	Cairngorm Ski Club
L291	Y1	Activity Scotland		L301	Y1	Sportscotland
L302	Y1	The Ramblers' Association Scotland		L321	Y2	British Horse Society (Tayside)
L326	Y1	Scottish Canoe Association		L372	Y1	Scottish Outdoor Recreation Network
L389	Y1	Scottish Advisory Panel for Outdoor Education		L395	Y1	The Mountaineering Council of Scotland

M: Social and economic groups (Total 3)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
M204	Y2	Scottish Council for Development and Industry		M248	Y2	Cairngorms Partnership Housing Forum
M373	Y2	Cairngorms Chamber Of Commerce				

N: Professional bodies (Total 8)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
N23	Y1	British Mountain Guides Association		N50	Y1	Town and Country Planning Association

N107	Y4	Association of National Parks Authorities		N194	Y1	Scottish Society of Directors of Planning
N203	Y1	The Royal Town Planning Institute		N300	Y1	Royal Institute of Architects
N304	Y1	The Institute of Chartered Foresters		N349	Y1	Institute of Biology

O: Research/academic organisations (Total 11)

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee		Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
O2	X5	Prof. C Reid, Department of Law, University Of Dundee		O7	Y3	Mr J Raemaekers, Sch.of Planning & Housing, Edinburgh College Of Art
O68	X5	Prof. C Gimingham, Dept. of Plant & Soil Science, University of Aberdeen		O176	X5	Professor D Jenkins, Dept of Zoology, University of Aberdeen
O177	Y4	Mr M Livingstone		O190	X5	Dr G Paton, Dept. of Soil Science, University of Aberdeen
O192	Y3	Dr J Milne, The Macaulay Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeen		O289	X5	Ms M de la Torre, School of Law, University of Aberdeen
O294	Y3	Mr S Macdonald, Elmwood College		O316	X4	Mr D Bryan, Moray College
O393	Y4	Dr D Falvey, British Geological Survey				

Table 2-2: Number of full written responses by response category and by geographic origin

	No. of Responses	%
By type of respondee	<u>396</u>	<u>100%</u>
Individuals/individual households	209	52
Individual landowners/managers/factors	20	5
Individual companies and businesses	19	5
Community councils and associations	15	4
Local Authorities (e.g. Perth and Kinross Council)	8	2
MSPs/MPs/ Local Authority Councillors	2	<1
National agencies (e.g. Scottish Environment Protection Agency)	6	2
Regional/Local public agencies (e.g. North of Scotland Water Authority)	10	2
Land Management groups (e.g. National Farmers' Union of Scotland)	22	5
Natural/Cultural Heritage Groups (e.g. RSPB, Gaelic groups)	39	10
Recreation and sport interest groups (e.g. Scottish Canoe Association)	24	6
Social and economic groups (e.g. Cairngorms Chamber of Commerce)	3	<1
Professional bodies (e.g. Royal Town Planning Institute)	8	2
Research/academic organisations/individual academics (e.g. The Macaulay Institute)	11	3
Others	0	0

	No. of Responses	%
By Geographic Origin of Response	<u>396</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Within the Park area</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>40</u>
Individuals within Option A	43	11
Individuals within Option B, outside A	17	5
Individuals within Option C, outside A and B	22	6
Organisations, overlapping with or within Option C (e.g. Aberdeenshire Council)	69	18
<u>Adjacent areas</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>15</u>
Individuals outside Option C but within the five Local authority areas	60	15
<u>Others outwith Park area</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>45</u>
Individuals outside the five local authority areas but within Scotland	69	17
National Organisations (e.g. VisitScotland STB/)	45	11
Other organisations, not within or overlapping with Option C (e.g. Cabrach and Mortlach Community Association)	41	10
Organisations and individuals based primarily outside Scotland	28	7
Unknown	<u>2</u>	<u><1</u>

Table 2-3: The main issues arising from the full written responses (with selected illustrative quotes), organised by key issue from the consultation document.

Key issue 1: Does the general area of the Cairngorms meet the legislative conditions for designation as a National Park?				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Yes Total 94	A0055X1 A0082X1 A0110X1 A0210X2 A0236X2 A0253X3 A0271X2 A0272X3 A0329X1 B0140X3 B0143X2 C0142X3 C0353Y2 D0191Y2 E0080Y2 E0104Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 H0106Y2 H0343Y2 J0093Y2 J0102Y2 J0330Y2 J0356Y2 K0112Y2 K0184Y2 K0221Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 K0341Y2 L0012Y2 L0041Y2 L0111Y2 L0226Y2	A0091X4 A0108X4 A0139X4 A0155X4 A0185X4 A0198X4 A0211X4 A0220X4 A0280X4 A0298X4	A0008X5 A0017X5 A0045Y3 A0063X5 A0087X5 A0116X5 A0121X5 A0164X5 A0179Y4 A0183X5 A0318X5 A0347X5 A0387X5 D0118Y3 E0145Y3 G0086Y1 J0114Y3 J0152Y1 J0352Y1 K0033Y3 K0127Y1 K0132Y3 K0144Y3 K0147Y3 K0149Y1 K0151Y1 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 K0165Y1 K0299X5 K0366Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 L0036Y3 L0156Y4	<p>I think there is a very strong case for establishing a National Park, based on the evidence that the area is of outstanding national importance because of its natural and cultural heritage. I believe that a National Park organisational structure will provide a means of safeguarding the interests of the area by providing an overarching and co-ordinating role. This is not to be seen as wholly regulatory but as an opportunity to provide flexibility and new approaches to the way the area is managed, in a sustainable way with the participation of all stakeholders. I believe that, if structured correctly, a National Park Authority can provide great opportunities for the area, building on the experiences in other countries. A0253X3</p> <p>I believe that the Cairngorms very clearly fulfil the legislative conditions for a National Park. The challenges you list in Box 1 are precisely the reasons why they would benefit from designation. Box 1 is spot on. A0017X5</p> <p>The Cairngorms is the most important area in Britain for montane plant communities and has a significant proportion of Scotland's semi-natural Scots pine woodland. The high plateaux, extensive heathland, broad straths and open pine and birch woodland all combine to give a distinctive character to the area. The BSBI has expressed concern in the past about conservation issues in the Cairngorms and hopes that the creation of a National Park will give an impetus to strategic planning for sustainability within the whole area. There is no doubt that the area meets the legislative conditions for National Park status. K0299X5</p> <p>There is no doubt that the area defined by all three options can be justified as a national heritage resource. Its mountains, glens and straths offer a unique example of a Highland landscape which, in terms of its scale and heritage interest, is unparalleled in Scotland. It has an identity defined by the comparison between its empty mountain massif and its inhabited wooded glens and straths. Its recent past management has been characterised by some seriously flawed episodes of degradation of its heritage value through inappropriate development and land use practices. These can be redeemed given the time, effort and resources which national park status should bring. The area could also benefit more from visitors by providing higher quality facilities and encouraging the development of the green tourism market. K0149Y1</p> <p>The SCA believes the area is of national importance and that it meets the legislative conditions for development as a National Park. The area supports a wide range of recreational activities and whilst we note the specified need to address visitor management issues we believe that existing provision and freedoms for non-motorised, informal recreations should be protected. L0326Y1</p> <p>I believe that the area under discussion is eminently suitable to become a National Park, and that the area would flourish under proper and concerned management. L0036Y3</p>

	L0254Y2 L0260Y2 L0321Y2 M0204Y2		L0161Y3 L0302Y1 L0326Y1 N0107Y4 N0203Y1 N0304Y1 O0007Y3 O0068X5 O0289X5 O0294Y3	
Yes ... but only if it covers the core area - Option A Total: 11	A0273X3 B0146Y2 B0324X2 C0092Y2 C0288Y2	A0079X4 D0290X4	A0057X5 C0306Y1 J0201Y1 L0291Y1	<p>Activity Scotland welcomes the proposal to have a National Park. Disappointment has been expressed about the lack of commitment to internationally recognised standards to define such a Park. The Association believes that the core Cairngorms area is an ideal example for a National Park and its many natural heritage assets demand such protection after many years of abuse and neglect. L0291Y1</p> <p>In summary the overall view of Scottish Woodlands Ltd is to support the proposal for a National Park in the Cairngorms provided this park is confined to a core area (Area A) to ensure that the resultant authority is sufficiently funded, appropriately represented and therefore is in a position to monitor the sustainability and conservation of natural and cultural resources in the area. C0288Y2</p>
Yes ... but only if it can secure conservation and recreational interests Total: 4		A0113X4	A0275X5 A0034Z K0147Y3	<p>For sake of clarity, we would emphasise that Plantlife strongly supports the need for a Cairngorms National Park as a way of ensuring the better protection and management of the area's natural heritage, including its plants. Any other objectives must be subservient to this overarching one, and any Park which failed to achieve this objective would be unacceptable from our point of view. K0147Y3</p> <p>My general wish is to see a National Park Authority set up which can limit the worst excesses of landowners in doing as they wish to the local environment e.g. bulldozed tracks and closing off access to the hills due to shooting. Any move to begin changing the nature of land-ownership and decision making about the land I see as a good thing. A0034Z</p>
Yes ... but only if it can secure social and economic objectives Total: 6	A0229X1 D0327Y2 M0373Y2	A0367X4	A0305X5 C0360Y3	<p>Subject to the foregoing comments - in particular the general principle that a National Park, whilst of National importance, fundamentally affects LOCAL people, and must therefore be seen to be locally accountable - and that the eventual area selected is not so large as to be unworkable, this Council supports the concept of a National Park for the Cairngorms. D0327Y2</p> <p>There is clearly a potential conflict between the objective of conservation and the objective of encouraging visitors to the area and more particularly encouraging those visitors to enjoy recreational activities in the Cairngorms. Hopefully it will be the case that the designation of the National Park will attract more visitors to the area. In the light of this, hopefully it will also be the case that appropriate developments aimed at accommodating the needs of these visitors and under-pinning the local economy will not be stifled by the conservation objectives of the Park. It is essential that the interests of those living and working in the Park are taken into account. A0229X1</p>

<p>No... or yet to be convinced Total: 42</p>	<p>A0069X1 A0109X1 A0122X2 A0148X3 A0173X1 A0225X1 A0272X3 A0317X1 A0342X3 A0394X1 B0001X1 B0138X3 B0140X3 B0167X1 B0223X2 B0324X2 B0337X1 B0348X1 B0396X3 C0075Y2 C0142X3 C0209Y2 D0096Y2 D0188Y2 E0399Y2 F0381X3 J0224Y2 J0241Y2 J0331Y2 L0226Y2</p>	<p>A0020X4 A0053X4 A0065X4 A0098X4 A0227X4 A0340X4 B0357X4 D0354X4</p>	<p>A0025X5 A0052Y3 A0059X5 J0208Y1</p>	<p>The Cairngorms Partnership already performs a splendidly effective co-ordinating role and acts as a facilitator. Given adequate project funding it could do much more. Is it too late to abort the designation procedure and enhance the present arrangement, which would be cheaper, less bureaucratic, and cause less disruption? B0001X1</p> <p>The area does not currently meet all the requirements. Becoming a National Park is a target towards which we should strive. Designation before the demonstration of commitment to excellence and measurable progress across all of the four aims would be damaging to all interests. B0348X1</p> <p>I was keen on the idea, as many were in the area, until the politicians started to indicate that it was a foregone conclusion and would happen regardless of local views, because it was politically 'sexy', but little attention or future intention given to allocating sufficient financial resources. F0381X3</p> <p>The main message to arise from our discussions is that the case for a National Park in the Cairngorms remains unproven. In particular, we are not convinced that designating the area as a National Park is the best way to meet its special needs and secure its future. This is largely because there is a lack of convincing argument explaining the overall benefits that will accrue to all parties, including landowners. J0208Y1</p> <p>The Mountain Bothies Association is not convinced that the creation of National Parks in Scotland will achieve benefits over and above those which would be available if Local and National Government powers were adequately applied. We have also expressed our concerns that the act of creating National Parks may have a detrimental effect on the areas so designated due to significantly increased public pressure. L0226Y2</p> <p>I view the current proposals with alarm. My chief worry on this report is that there is far too much concern with the local population and far too little attention that this is a National Park for Scotland as a whole. It is an area which should be in trust for the future generations of all the country. A0173X1</p> <p>The main argument presented in the proposal document is that additional resources will be made available to the area to deal with the problems of conflict of interests, erosion, public access at private cost etc. We have been waiting for these resources since the Cairngorms Working Party delivered their report in 1992. I can see no justification for the cost and complexity of an extra bureaucratic layer of administration which will take away some powers from the local authorities. This is already causing resentment and will hardly foster co-operation from the local authorities. C0142X3</p> <p>It may be suitable for other parts of Scotland, but the Cairngorms are special, and the only way to preserve their essential wildness is to keep people away. This will not be achieved by National Park status which will advertise and promote the Area in all sorts of ways, and to all sorts of people, however unwittingly. A0053X4</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>The decision on the Park has already been taken Total: 5</p>	<p>B0140X3 B0167X1 B0324X2</p>	<p>A0065X4 A0227X4</p>		<p>Since the Executive are clearly determined on their course to create National Parks, against the better judgement and best interests of the inhabitants of those areas, we have to make the best we can of these decisions,. B0140X3</p> <p>I recognise that the establishment of the Park is a fait accompli because it is in sympathy with the vogue for regulation and because it will be an irresistible "pork barrel" for those who stand to gain financially, for example by receipt of grants or employment, at the expense of the taxpayer. A0065X4</p> <p>There is a feeling that the consultation process has become a necessary stage in government process in order to let politicians say, at a future date, that the public were consulted, even though courses of action had been determined at the outset. In effect, what we say when consulted has not the slightest effect, because minds are already made up. Let us hope this is not the case. B0167X1</p>
<p>Other views on the merit of creating one or more National Parks in Scotland Total: 11</p>	<p>A0026X3 B0062X2 B0062X2 J0073Y2</p>	<p>A0200X4</p>	<p>A0084X5 A0369X5 C0051Y3 J0313Y1 L0395Y1 O0190X5</p>	<p>Do not see the necessity to form a Cairngorm National Park. A high percentage of the Highlands and North of Scotland is of equal natural, environmental and cultural significance. Picking out one area will create a honey-pot for development and visitor numbers. B0062X2</p> <p>This then leads on to the much bigger question: should not the whole of Scotland north of the Highland Line be a National Park or a series of contiguous Parks? A0084X5</p> <p>As such I would like to see one umbrella organisation managing three Parks. The Parks would be Deeside, Speyside and Cairngorm Mountain Park. The Mountain Park would be Option A but not extending as far as Tomintoul in the north east of Kingussie in the west. This would be habitat and land-use defined more than altitudinal but would reflect the high plateau and the terrain of the montane environment. To the West Option B would become Speyside and to the east Option B would be Deeside. Strathdon, Tomintoul and Ben Rinnes would lie outside the Park areas. Option C in my view has too many agricultural and land management conflicts that would detract from the need for preservation of the rest of the site. O0190X5</p> <p>Firstly I am very critical of this concept of creating pockets of National Parks around Scotland. We should have one encompassing Designation for a far greater area. I find it literally impossible to understand where The Loch Lomond and Cairngorm Parks should end. C0051Y3</p>

Key Issue 2: Views on the appropriate size of the National Park (Option A was the smallest option and Option C the largest)				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Option A Total: 51	A0049X3 A0072X1 A0097X1 A0148X3 A0213X1 A0225X1 A0229X1 A0272X3 A0273X3 A0382X1 B0062X2 B0146Y2 B0223X2 B0287Y2 B0324X2 B0396X3 C0092Y2 C0288Y2 C0288Y2 D0188Y2 E0399Y2 H0343Y2 J0224Y2 J0331Y2	A0040 X4 A0205 X4 A0227 X4 A0247 X4 A0248 X4 A0284 X4 A0340 X4 A0362 X4 D0354 X4	A0017X5 A0025X5 A0061Y4 A0084X5 A0159X5 A0187X5 A0266X5 A0346X5 A0383X5 A0398X5 A0401X5 C0306Y1 J0168Y1 J0313Y1 L0156Y4 L0175X5 O0007Y3 O0176X5	<p>I strongly favour Option A. The granite ground of the 'true Cairngorms' (Section 8 of Munros Tables, your Zone 1) is distinctive and quite different from anywhere else in the UK. This area is particularly needing NP protection A0017</p> <p>Option A would be suitable area. It is important that there is recognisable identity and cohesion to the Park. It is unfortunate that there is not better road communications between the east and west communities. Enlarging the areas to include Blair Atholl, Pitlochry etc. will lead to increased divergence. B0062</p> <p>The only suitable sensible and feasible option is Option A. // Option A contains all the major peaks of the high Cairngorms. // Extending into Option B would take in undulating countryside not strictly homogenous to the main massif. //Option C would be totally unwieldy, unmanageable area of the countryside some of which is devoid of peaks and mountains. A0097</p> <p>Since this is a new type of administration there is also a case for keeping the area small for an initial period of establishment after which consideration can be given to whether the boundaries of the park should be extended and additional areas absorbed into the administration C0092</p> <p>Option A appears to me to fully meet National Park criteria as does Option B although the vast area involved in this second option will make it difficult for it to be administered effectively in accordance with National Park principles. L0156</p> <p>The Park should be developed in two or more stages, the first defining the core area and including samples of nearby moorland and straths. The core area should be the central massif, with its boundary running through Glen Clunie, by-passing Braemar, and intersecting Invercauld Estate to Glen Avon, the marches of Abernethy and R. Spey, R. Feshie, and the south eastern and north western boundaries as in option A. The second stage should be to extend the Park to include the whole of option A, including Lochnagar and Glen Muick. //A third stage could be the inclusion of other sustainably managed areas following applications by their owners. // The National Park should be extensible by voluntary agreement, though not necessarily to the size of options B or C. In practice, the extent of the Park will be limited by the Park's finances. O0176</p> <p>We largely favour Option A, the smaller area, however this will inevitably be dominated by Highland Council and Speyside. In essence we fear being second class citizens in a Speyside dominated Park. D0188</p> <p>Option A - let us start small and increase if the Park is a success: easier to add than subtract. I do not see what places such as Loch Laggan, Rannoch, Pitlochry, Edzell, Kincardine O'Neil have in common with the mountains around Cairngorm. A0284</p> <p>To spread the resources too thinly to make an impact would be a major mistake particularly in the early years of the life of the Authority. By restricting the National Park area to approximately Area A it emphasises the priorities</p>

				of the Authority namely that of land management and the management of visitors rather than the exercising wider Local Government powers. E0399
Slightly larger than Option A Total: 35	A0055X1 A0064X1 A0076X1 L0111Y2 E0126Y2 B0140X3 C0142X3 A0219X2 A0278X1 C0309Y2 A0314X3 A0315X1 D0327Y2 H0344Y2 B0348X1 A0355X1 A0370X1 M373Y2 F0381X3	A0079X4 A0220 X4 A0391 X4	A0024X5 A0044Y3 N0050Y1 G0086Y1 A0121X5 K0147Y3 A0160X5 K0165Y1 A0183X5 G0199Y1 O0294Y3 L0301Y1 L0326Y1	<p>Option B: Is far too large and lacks a coherent identity because of the inclusion of the middle reaches of the Angus glens, the Monadhliath Mountains and the area north of the northern boundary of Option A (i.e. around the Rivers Spey and Avon). A0024</p> <p>My own preference is for a combination of option A and B along the lines proposed in the Mountain Areas Scotland Review (1991) but with the inclusion of settlements. No matter what the boundary, administration is never going to be 'easy' so it should not be considered to be a determining factor in the size of the National Park. A0055</p> <p>Some small extensions may be in order rather than the whole of option B. // For example the area marked Forest of Atholl (from Laggan to Pitlochry) may well be one that the local people may feel should be included in the Cairngorm National Park However, from a forestry perspective, we suggest that greater cohesion and sense of identity could be achieved by concentrating on the core (Option A) area - which contains a very significant concentration of native woodlands. This might, however, be extended - for example by including the headwaters of the Spey and Glen Doll. G0086</p> <p>We do not feel that the Angus Glens have a great deal in common with the central Cairngorm massif. While the Drumochter Hills and the Ben Alder and Creag Meagaidh areas are upland areas of high conservation value they are, as the Consultation Document points out, different in character from the Cairngorm massif. L0111</p> <p>Include part of the National Park area extending into Angus focussing around the National Scenic Area and National Nature Reserve at Caenlochan together with immediately adjacent parts of Glen Isla, Glen Prosen and Glen Clova forming the northern section of SNH Sub Area 13.//This preferred option, which lies between SNH Options A and B, most fully reflects all the conditions set for a National Park. E0126</p> <p>I do not, however, agree with Option A as it currently stands and I would like to see the boundaries altered. I would prefer the following sub-units as the core of the park: Sub-units 1, 4 and 17. This would allow for the protection of a larger area of contiguous wild country, un-bisected by major through-roads. A0220</p> <p>The boundary should extend south to take in the Angus Glens - Esk, Prosen and Clova. These form an important gateway to the south and have sufficient visitor numbers to warrant inclusion, along with associated pressure. In addition a Ranger Service exists to help 'spread the word' of responsible access/integrated use.// 2) There may be a case for extending the park down the corridors of the Spey and Dee - say to Grantown and Aboyne respectively. O0294</p> <p>We would support designation of an area somewhere between Option A and Option B, to include 'gateway' communities notably Grantown on Spey, Laggan and Dalwhinnie. H0344</p>

Slightly smaller than Option A Total: 7	A0103X1 A0163X3 A0178X1	A0065 X4	A0059X5 A0116X5 J0201Y1	<p>It is at least arguable that the preferred area should be smaller even than option A, because it is by no means clear that the Lochnagar-Glas Maol area is organically part of the Cairngorms or has major problems in common with the Cairngorms. A0059</p> <p>The area should be Option A or less, to exclude the larger settlements on Speyside (e.g. Aviemore, Kingussie etc) and Deeside (Braemar and Ballater) on the grounds that this will minimise overlap with the functions of local authorities. A0065</p>
Option B Total: 36	A0015X3 A0019X2 A0095X2 A0312X2 B0078X2 C0353Y2 E0123Y2 G0157Y2 H0054Y2 H0106Y2 H0136Y2 J0073Y2 K0197Y2 L0012Y2	A0099X4 A0108X4 A0238X4 A0265X4 A0298X4 A0367X4	A0034Z A0063X5 A0083X5 A0124X5 A0239Y1 A0244X5 A0249X5 A0296X5 A0387X5 D0195Y3 K0100Y3 K0132Y3 L0036Y3 L0389Y1 N0107Y4 N0300Y1	<p>A bigger area is needed to a) preserve the scenic integrity, b) extend the range of biodiversity, c) include settlements culturally linked to the area. Furthermore, I would be concerned that if the area of the park were too small, then visitor concentrations might be damaging. L0012</p> <p>I am even more firmly of the opinion that our interests in the Angus glens, and indeed the whole of Angus are best served by being in the new Park, and that area Option B meets all our interests best. A0015</p> <p>The area covered by Option A is I believe too small to provide sufficient protection to the natural heritage of the Cairngorms or to benefit the surrounding communities. In particular this option excludes much land that is identified with and seen very much as part of the Cairngorms. A0063</p> <p>The scale of management must stretch to include areas which influence the core area. Option B may therefore be the best compromise from the proposals presented. J0073</p> <p>... we would suggest that Option B is the most appropriate area as many of the additional areas in Option C show landscape and natural heritage characteristics significantly different from those contained in Options A and B. H0106</p> <p>The Council support the larger area as shown in Option B and Option C. These options include the Core mountain area and extend down to include Ben Rinnes which the Council asked to be included within the Cairngorms Partnership area as it is of the same character and faces the same issues as the core mountain area. IE0123</p>
Slightly larger than Option B Total: 26	A0082X1 E0104Y2 B0143X3 D0169Y2 A0172X1 M204Y2 F0230X2 A0253X3 C0276Y2 A0333X1	A0185X4 A0198X4 A0211X4 A0237X4 A0280X4	K0060Y1 O0068X5 J0152Y1 A0162X5 O0192Y3 N0203Y1 A0299X5 A0347X5 K0366Y1 L0372Y1 K0385Y3	<p>Option B is probably the best boundary with the addition of the River Spey watershed and south-eastern part of the Monadhliath Mountains. K0060</p> <p>In addition to the sub-units comprising Option B, the Council believes that sub-units 22, 24, 27 and a small part of Sub-unit 19 should be included for the following reasons:- The entire water catchment of the River Spey should be included given the river's status as a candidate Special Area of Conservation and the central role the Spey plays in relation to life in Badenoch and Strathspey.// Historically, two focuses of power controlling and influencing life in Badenoch and Strathspey are the ancient Pictish Fort of Dun da Lambh (in Sub-unit 24) and Lochindorb (in Sub-unit 27). Both sites are central to interpreting the history and culture of the entire Badenoch and Strathspey Area. Also, surrounding areas of moor and hill were used for grazing and summer sheilings.//South of Dalwhinnie, it is desirable to include the area to the west of the A9 up to Loch Ericht</p>

				<p>because of the visual impact and gateway "feeling" created by the Drumochter Pass. E0104</p> <p>Option B with the whole of Badenoch and Strathspey provides a suitable size for the administration of the Park and forms a coherent whole. Whatever boundaries are eventually decided, Grantown-on-Spey should be included because of its historic and cultural links. D0169</p> <p>The modified area, including the main settlements of Braemar, Ballater, Aboyne, Strathdon, Tomintoul, Grantown-on-Spey, Newtonmore, Dalwhinnie and Blair Atholl encompass the local authorities of Aberdeenshire, Angus, Highland, Moray and Perth & Kinross.// The area should include important recreational resources, notably around the Speyside way, in the Angus Glens, around Drumochter, Glen Tilt and on Deeside.// SCDI believes that good cases have been made to further extend option B to include the whole of the River Spey water catchment area and to extend the Park west of the A9 to Loch Ericht, due to the popularity for hill-walking encouraged by ready access of the A9 and the gateway effect to the Highlands created by the Drumochter Pass./ M0204</p> <p>This is the area most under development pressure and in need of action to enhance the environment, and raise standards. However the Laggan and Lochindorb areas in Badenoch and Strathspey should be added, using the district/watershed boundary, as they are strongly linked culturally and socially. F0230</p> <p>SORN considers that the whole of the core area, indicated in red on consultation map 2 and covering sub areas 1, 2, 3 and 5 should be included in the National Park. The area contains some of the best wild land and landscape experiences in Scotland and SORN considers that there is a need to protect and manage these through the resources and powers of a National Park. L0372</p>
Slightly smaller than Option B Total: 6	H0171Y2 L0260Y2	A0200X4 A0332X4	A0052Y3 O0289X5	<p>Equally, the area should not be so large as to begin to lose a common identity, such as I suspect would be the case with Option C, or the Cairngorms Partnership area. // The Forest of Atholl, Glen Bruar and upper Glen Feshie are very much a part of the whole, integral landscape, much in need of restorative care. The incorporation of Glen Tilt is additionally important to maintain the continuing restriction on vehicular access to the general public, as this is vital to the protection for the unique qualities of the area; A0052</p> <p>However, we would suggest that overall the area is slightly smaller particularly in relation to Angus. We would, however, like to see the southern boundary extended slightly to encompass both Kirriemuir and Edzell.// The case for including areas of farm land in Angus and North Perthshire east of the A9 is much harder to justify. H0171</p> <p>Omit Aviemore and the ski areas, include Grantown and follow Option B the rest of the way, but keep well clear of Aboyne. Bring the boundary in to omit the eyesore of the ski development at Cairnwell then revert to Option B. A0200</p>
Option C Total: 57	A0180X1 A0182X1 A0210X2 A0267X2	A0037 X4 A0053 X4 A0091 X4 A0139 X4	A0006X5 A0008X5 A0010X5 A0047Y3	<p>I suggest that this should be as large as possible (approximating to Option C) mainly because I place an overriding value on ecological conservation and sustainable development in harmony with the land, and wish to see this emphasised as widely as possible, and because it has been shown world-wide that conservation of small packets of land is generally ineffective in preserving biodiversity. I would also suggest that to designate a</p>

	A0319X1 A0329X1 C0105Y2 C0209Y2 D0217Y2 H0252Y2 J0216Y2 J0261Y2 J0330Y2 K0222Y2 K0269Y2 K0341Y2	A0228 X4 A0240 X4 A0274 X4 A0363 X4 A0364 X4 O0295 X4	A0087X5 A0120X5 A0128X5 A0135X5 A0179X5 A0243X5 A0250X5 A0263X5 A0270X5 A0310X5 A0318X5 A0350X5 A0369X5 A0379X5 A0380X5 A0392X5 C0051Y3 C0071Y4 D0303Y3 E0145Y3 K0005Y1 K0009Y3 K0042Y3 K0144Y3 L0133Y3 L0189Y3 N0349Y1	<p>larger area as National Park will tend to spread any 'honey-pot' effect, which will be to the benefit of both the resident population and the natural environment. A0010</p> <p>The Commission's opinion is that the area of designation should therefore incorporate the lowland areas together with the major settlements, as well as the Cairngorm massif. National Park status would help to ensure that all these areas are preserved and enhanced, and that special features including views are protected from inappropriate development. The largest of the three area options (Option C) would encompass all these important areas, whilst also permitting effective and efficient management and administration of the K0042</p> <p>Option C would be my preferred choice because it is important to incorporate the whole catchment of the upper Spey and its tributaries as well as the upper catchments of all the other river systems which drain from the Cairngorms. On the matter of scenic value alone there seems little reason to exclude those sub-units that fall within option C but not in option B. They seem as valuable with respect to heritage as those sub-units within option B.// With respect to the large size and the matter of efficient management of the National Park, there are National Parks in other countries that are bigger than this proposal and yet are still manageable. A0120</p> <p>The Board is of the opinion that the opportunities afforded by the Park boundary should extend to include the three principal gateway communities in Angus as well as the Angus Glens themselves. H0252</p> <p>From a fish and fisheries management viewpoint not just the core area (option A), but the whole of the largest of the three options (option C) is very important for the aquatic natural heritage, owing the presence of spawning areas for spring running salmon, charr populations and pearl mussel populations, for example. We therefore favour option C, assuming this does not compromise, through stretching available financial resources, the level of protection that will be directed towards freshwater habitats. J0330</p>
Slightly larger than Option C Total: 3	E0080Y2 H0031Y2		K0127Y1	Although it was not one of your options it was strongly felt that in view of their immense importance, both Loch Rannoch and Schiehallion should also be included. H0031Y2
Slightly smaller than Option C Total: 10	A0066X1 A0085X1 A0110X1 B0138X3 K0221Y2 L0321Y2	A0277 X4	A0045Y3 A0090X5 A0297X5	<p>On this basis, I favour one of the larger options, certainly larger than Option B (to take in the upper Spey catchment, for example) but not necessarily to quite the extent of Option C. In fact, the Cairngorms Partnership area has much to recommend it, though the actual boundary should run along watersheds where possible and so some adjustment may be necessary. A0277</p> <p>The present Cairngorm Partnership Boundary should be regarded as the minimum size that would deliver this. // My preferred option for the National Park area is Option C but excluding the towns of Pitlochry, Kirriemuir and Brechin. A0045</p> <p>The southern boundary (in Angus) appears to be too far south as it encloses rich agricultural land. Perhaps the Highland Boundary Fault would form a suitable natural boundary.// The upper Spey catchment area needs</p>

				protection within this National Park. As the source of a major water resource it affects what happens within the Cairngorms. However worthy of further protection, Creag Meagaidh and land to the south do not form a coherent whole with the Cairngorm massif.// Overall, we favour designation of the largest area (option C with the provisos mentioned) K0221
Cairngorms Partnership boundary or similar Total: 29	A0030X3 A0094Y2 A0236X2 A0236X2 A0271X2 B0001X1 B0138X3 B0337X1 D0202Y2 J0241Y2 K0184Y2 K0255Y2	A0155 X4 A0186 X4 O0316 X4	A0206X5 A0262X5 A0285X5 D0195Y3 J0152Y1 J0208Y1 J0352Y1 K0149Y1 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 K0170Y1 K0384Y1 L0302Y1 L0395Y1	<p>I have maintained that the present Partnership area is about right and has the virtue of being established now. Any change would require strong grounds. B0001</p> <p>A modified Option C is preferred - based on the existing Partnership Area. This will ensure that the Park does not become dominated by social problems within Badenoch and Strathspey and will most closely balance area of park with population. //There would have to be a very good reason to change from the existing Cairngorms Partnership Area. It now has the coherent identity that the legislation requires. B0138</p> <p>Presumably there was logic in the definition of this boundary in the first place and we see no reason for abandoning it. K0158</p> <p>The size of the National Park must be large enough to allow for zoning of different, often competing interests, but not so large as to be unmanageable.// The high mountain character of the area encompassed by Strathspey, Strath Avon, Strath Don, Deeside, the Angus Glens and Glen Garry offers a sense of continuity without artificial boundaries. The preferred option should therefore be the Cairngorms Partnership area with the addition of sub-unit 23. K0149</p> <p>LINK members agree that the area of the Cairngorms Partnership should form the basis of the National Park. The Partnership's experience has demonstrated that this is an effective and efficient management unit. However, in order to optimise effective management, LINK members believe that the administration should be devolved, but the boundary should cut across the Angus Glens - leaving in the upper glens of high conservation importance and recreational access routes, but not necessarily including all the lower glens. K0255</p>
Other suggestions for the area of the Park Total: 20	A0003X1 A0058X3 A0259X1 A0338X3 A0342X3 L0056Y2 L0226Y2 L0256Y2	A0079X4 A0200X4 B0193X4	A0016Z A0131X5 A0232X5 A0275X5 A0369X5 A0400X5 C0081X5 D0110Y3 L0291Y1	<p>I propose that the area of National Park be within the inside road around the Cairngorms. The settlements could be totally included or excluded as in the principles laid out in the consultation document. By proposing a smaller area than in the consultation document, I am not suggesting that the areas I am excluding are not of great importance, but areas like Lochnagar and the Monadhliath Mountains might be better served with their own conservation proposals and local input. A0003</p> <p>In the light of foot and mouth disease and the likely review of "rural Scotland" then a pan-Highland National Park covering most of non-urban Scotland could be a forward thinking and radical alternative to the current choices. This would put the land and landscapes, environment and sustainability, people and communities at the heart of a 21st Century Scotland. L0291</p>
Interest expressed but no comment			O0002X5 K0060Y1	The Trust does not have a specific view on the extent of the geographical area covered by the National Park designation. We are concerned with the view expressed in paragraph 3.6 that too large an area would create problems for effective administration and could lead to management problems. We can see no reason why this should be the case. Highland Council remains the largest local authority in Europe, but there have been no

Total: 2				calls for its break-up as a political and administrative unit K0060
Comments on the process by which the area should be developed, or on this aspect of the consultation document Total: 18	A0094Y2 A0394X1 B0138X3 C0142X3 K0112Y2 K0255Y2	A0020 X4 A0029 X4 O0316 X4	A0063X5 A0251X5 A0387X5 J0208Y1 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 N0203Y1 N0349Y1 O0190X5	<p>From my knowledge of the soil survey maps, it seems that appreciable areas of Grade 3 land are included in Option C and some areas in both A and B. I do not consider it appropriate to include significant areas of long established farm land in a National Park. A0029</p> <p>However we recommend that the choice of overall size of the Park should be made on the basis of areas fulfilling the criteria set down in the Act and resources then found to make the management of this area effective rather than using the limits of budget and resources to determine the size of the National Park. K0112</p> <p>In offering three options, including the maximum proposal made by Ministers and two others, one of which is only a third of the area of the Ministers' proposal, the consultation report exudes great uncertainty with regard to the principles upon which a National Park in the Cairngorms will be established. N0203</p> <p>Any questions of area and boundaries must depend on the practical (and political!) constraints of creating a Park Authority with planning powers. A0251</p>
Comments on specific areas with no stated preference for the overall size of the Park Total: 44	A0026X3 A0122X2 A0148X3 A0273X3 A0322X3 A0382X1 B0048X3 B0078X2 B0287Y2 C0092Y2 C0142X3 C0258X3 C0361Y2 D0129X3 D0191Y2 D0376Y2 E0104Y2 F0230X2 J0356Y2 J0356Y2 K0269Y2 L0012Y2 L0111Y2 L0260Y2 M0204Y2 M0373Y2	A0108 X4 A0113 X4 A0115 X4 A0280 X4 A0320 X4 A0334 X4 B0193 X4 B0357 X4	A0057X5 A0121X5 A0124X5 A0137X5 A0266X5 B0077Y3 J0152Y1 K0147Y3 L0292Y1 N0203Y1	<p>It would be particularly burdensome in the Angus glens to be included as these are closest to major population centres, both urban and rural, and would come to bear an unfair proportion of traffic, whereas the real Cairngorms are so remote. A0026</p> <p>We feel that Aboyne is too far away from the Cairngorms to be included in any National Park. B0048</p> <p>There is relatively little in Aviemore of conservation value A0113</p> <p>The area should have a coherent identity, so I might question the inclusion of areas with mainly "lowland" character, perhaps areas 12 and 14 in Map 4, and the exclusion of the manifestly "highland" area in the south-western corner, i.e. Loch Rannoch and Schiehallion. D0129</p> <p>The whole of Badenoch & Strathspey must be included as a unit - from Lochindorb, Tormore and Slochd down to Laggan, Loch Laggan and Dalwhinnie. All part of one Local Authority Area, so administratively would be better to include it all. Southern and eastern areas were felt to have different heritage and not to be very 'Cairngorm'. D0191</p> <p>It is not clear if the Lecht and Glenshee ski areas would be wholly within the National Park. The boundaries should be set to include both areas in their entirety. A0266</p> <p>These elements all tie in with the special qualities and distinctiveness of the Cairngorms and Birse is now becoming seen as one of the special locations that are characteristic of the area and which exemplify the values appropriate to national park status. A0320</p> <p>Grantown needs to be in the National Park area. It is a beautiful town, with a history, unlike other smaller settlements such as Aviemore, which has no historical features whatsoever. C0361</p>

				There is a case for taking the boundary in toward the head, for example, of the Angus glens. These are the key access points - and there are areas of high natural heritage importance, such as the Caenlochan NNR/SSSI. A0108
Suggestions for 'gateway' locations Total: 8	C0105Y2 E0080Y2 E0126Y2 H0054Y2 H0171Y2 J0093Y2 L0039X2		K0154Y1 N0203	<p>The Council recommends that a National Park Gateway Centre be established at Blair Atholl, whether or not it is within the National Park. E0080</p> <p>Pitlochry to act as the natural Southern Gateway into the Park. C0105</p> <p>There is a case for extending the boundary to include communities beyond the core to allow for a series of gateways into the Park, for example, Blair Atholl, Kirriemuir and Edzell. Being included within the National Park would offer these communities a strong image and provide huge marketing opportunities for tourism as well as other businesses. H0171</p> <p>We believe that Ballater (and not Aboyne or Tarland) should be the gateway to the east and that Edzell, Brechin and Kirriemuir offer no significant role with regard to access to the core area of the proposed National Park. N0203</p>

Key Issue 3: Area of the National Park. Views on the suggested approach to assess the area against the conditions in the Act

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Agreement with suggested approach Total: 33	A0072X1 A0272X3 B0001X1 B0146Y2 B0337X1 C0092Y2 E0123Y2 E0126Y2 F0230X2 H0054Y2 J0093Y2 K0255Y2 M0204Y2	A0004 X4 A0108 X4 A0139 X4 A0198 X4 A0298 X4 S0298 X4	A0087X5 A0116X5 A0183X5 C0306Y1 E0145Y3 J0093Y2 K0149Y1 K0158Y1 K0366Y1 L0056Y3 L0302Y1 N0107Y4 O0068X5 O0289X5	<p>I am happy in general with the approach SNH has adopted to assess the area, and with the evaluation framework for deciding on the incorporation of sub-units. O0068</p> <p>Angus Council considers that the approach adopted is logical, practical and helpful in helping to construct and assess illustrative options for consideration, recognising that there are many variations possible between the broad options presented to assist public consultation. E0126</p> <p>Clearly there are huge difficulties in making the assessment of what should be in and what should be left out of the park area but the approach by SNH appears to be reasonable. B0146</p>
Suggested prioritisation of particular criteria Total: 7	B0348X1 J0093Y2 K0341Y2 L0226Y2		A0052Y3 A0063X5 N0203Y1	<p>The special needs of the area, so far as the National Park is concerned, should be confined to the natural, and to a lesser extent, cultural needs, and to the management of the natural and cultural heritage. A0052</p> <p>If the sub-unit had a weak 'distinctive character' in relation to the overall character of the Cairngorms, then I would prefer to see it categorised at best as 'weaker case for inclusion'. I feel that greater weighting should be attached to this condition. A0063</p> <p>Therefore funding considerations should play no part in deciding the area of the park. K0341</p>
Emphasis on need for flexibility in applying the approach Total: 5	A0342X3 B0146Y2 M0373Y2	A0079 X4	A0083X5	<p>It is important that a methodology be used to assess each area so as to incorporate and be seen to incorporate, a high level of objectivity in decision making. There may be cases where the SNH procedures procure a result incompatible with common sense. In such cases departure from the procedure may be acceptable. A0079</p> <p>We welcome the methodology that SNH has created to resolve this problem. However a flexible approach must be taken to reaching conclusions from the evaluation framework. M0373</p>
Comment on sub-unit boundaries Total: 6	A0110X1 C0142X3 E0104Y2 K0221Y2		N0304Y1 J0208Y1	<p>The approach seems reasonable, and so the Council has no additional comment other than that possible boundary lines cut across some of the sub-unit areas, e.g. sub-unit 24 is partly within the Spey catchment and partly beyond, and sub-unit 19 is partly within The Highland Council and partly within Perth and Kinross Council. E0104</p> <p>The proposed methodology has great merit and is widely supported by the Institute's members. N0304</p> <p>The choice of sub-units in a number of cases divorces the land from the communities who manage it and rely upon it for their wellbeing. J0208</p>

Need to consider area as a whole as well as, or instead of, proposed approach Total: 7	A0210X2 A0236X2		A0059X5 A0120X5 J0352Y1 O0192Y3 O0294Y3	<p>However, I feel that care has to be taken to not just consider each sub-unit as an isolated bit of land since the sub units are all part of an integrated area, i.e. some sub-units may be worthy of inclusion due to the inclusion of neighbouring sub-units. A0120</p> <p>It is important, however, to ensure that the Park is viewed as one unit rather than a grouping of smaller areas. J0352</p> <p>Annex 3 focuses on sub-units and appears to test their integrity as units (which is not particularly relevant) as well as the strength of the case for their inclusion in the park. Surely each of the models for the park needs to be looked at primarily in terms of whether it makes sense as a whole, not whether particular bits would qualify to be added on. A0059</p>
SNH should have done the assessment first Total: 4	K0269Y2		N0203Y1 K0165Y1 K0060Y1	<p>The same technique, outlined in Appendix 3, as was used before has been used for generating the options but, unlike the proposal for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs, no details are given of the analysis and scoring of the 29 sub units.// We find the absence of the detailed analysis for each of the 29 sub units a major deficiency. We agree that the evaluation framework is broadly appropriate. N0203</p> <p>It would have been extremely useful if this approach had not only been suggested but carried out in the document, particularly in light of the fact that a similar exercise using the same criteria was undertaken for the proposed Loch Lomond and TheTrossachs National Park. K0165</p>
Incorporate catchments in the assessment process Total: 3	H0106Y2 C0142X3		K0164X5	<p>Inclusion of the catchment area able to affect the interests of the national park will ensure their protection, while natural heritage zones can be used to link catchments using habitats that occur across multiple catchments. With this in mind we would urge that the importance of both is made explicit as part of the assessment approach. H0106</p>
Other criticisms of the suggested approach Total: 4	B0140X3 A0236X2 C0142X3	A0020X4		<p>Annex 3 is so cluttered with 'Local-Authority-Speak' that I can't follow it. B0140</p> <p>Option areas are described superficially in geographical and other terms, without the necessary analysis of how each option might fit or not fit the concept of a National Park, and hence without rational justification.// Clearer options should be given, with impartially stated pros and cons in the text, The text lacks any justification. It is too descriptive without a clear prior rationale for the descriptions, and too lacking in analytical judgement. A0020X4</p>

Key Issue 4: Additional information to be considered				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Social considerations Total: 8	A0272X3 E0123Y2 E0126Y2 G0157Y2 L0012Y2	A0220 X4	J0352Y1 K0033Y3	<p>From a social point of view it makes sense not to separate Tomintoul from its hinterland. //The Cairngorms Housing Forum will be including housing information across the area in its submission. E0123</p> <p>I believe that the criteria set out, and the system proposed is fair and reasonable. I know that account is taken of this elsewhere, but I would include "sporting traditions" as a possible indicator of coherent identity. I think that traditions of Shinty and Curling, and Highland Games are important enough to be included as indicators. L0012</p> <p>... it should be stressed that Gaelic is one of Scotland's national languages and should be treated as such in all locations within the national bounds. // As indicated above virtually all of the Option C area included local native Gaelic speakers well into the 20th century, and possibly the 21st century in Badenoch and Strathspey. Furthermore, full-time Gaelic-medium education is a local authority provision within the minimum Option A area (in Newtonmore Primary School) and other new Gaelic speakers, learners and immigrant native speakers are to be found in all the Option C communities. K0033</p>
Economic information Total: 21	A0178X1 A0271X2 B0143X3 B0337X1 B0348X1 C0142X3 J0216Y2 J0241Y2 J0261Y2	A0079 X4	A0059X5 A0087X5 A0387X5 C0306Y1 E0246Y3 J0208Y1 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 L0326Y1 N0349Y1 O0289X5	<p>The pattern of ownership is highly relevant to various issues raised in the document e.g. land management and planning control. One would not want to introduce unnecessary items of controversy, but the consultation should take account of the Executive's stated intention, lying behind the considerable amount of legislation which has been introduced in Parliament, to see a more varied pattern of land holding in rural Scotland. A0059</p> <p>There is no useful socio-economic information available on the proposed Park area. It is therefore difficult to predict the socio-economic impact of any proposed course of action. This Key Issue seems to be a vain hope to get something for nothing. C0142</p> <p>Recognition must be taken of the key economic and environmental input of the Spey Fishery. J0261</p> <p>Tourism in general and outdoor recreation specifically are key to the economic health of Scotland. This has been acutely brought to light by the outbreak of Foot and Mouth and the impact it has had on the tourist economy. Further efforts should be made to quantify economically the importance of this type of recreation to the area within the designated zone. L0326</p>
Environmental information Total: 30	A0082X1 A0095X2 E0104Y2 E0399Y2 H0054Y2 J0073Y2 J0216Y2	A0099 X4	A0131X5 A0369X5 J0070Y1 J0201Y1 K0060Y1 K0100Y3 K0127Y1	<p>We would be happy to provide what information we have on buildings at risk within the general park area if it would prove useful. // The Trust is also highlighted in national policy guidance (notably NPPG 18: Planning and the Historic Environment and the Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) as a suitable body to consult on matters of cultural heritage and amenity. We also act as consultees to many planning authorities on planning applications, and would be happy to assist SNH, and eventually, the Parks Authority on such matters. K0060</p>

	J0307Y2 J0330Y2 L0041Y2 L0260Y2		<p>K0132Y3 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 K0164X5 K0384Y1 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 N0349Y1 O0068X5 O0289X5 O0294Y3</p> <p>To promote a collaborative approach to the management of a common deer resource, the DCS advises that SNH must recognise and take into account deer management boundaries when formulating advice for Ministers. J0070</p> <p>There are important populations of golden eagle, peregrine and harrier. Dotterel breed on the tops. Goldeneye and Black-throated diver in the lochs. Caper still exist here, Osprey and kite have been seen nest building. // The bee <i>Osmium inermis</i> has active populations in this area. // Native tree cover is minimal due to overgrazing by deer and sheep and yet in most of the gullies in glens like Glen Tilt and Bruar there are significant remnant resources of these native trees. In one high gully there are 12 species of native tree. // We have some important SSSIs and other areas of botanical importance. <i>Betula nana</i>, the alpine birch, can be found in the Atholl hills. A0095</p> <p>The wider extent of the Park could be determined by biogeographic identity, and I consider that use might be made of SNH work on Natural Heritage Zones in setting this. K0164</p> <p>The Angus Glens, sub units 11 and 13, surely have enough cultural and natural heritage value to 'score' heavily? Achievement of the 4 broad aims has begun under the Angus Glens Ranger Service and the should could in any assessment. Equally the deployment by Balmoral of a Stalker/Ranger in this area would enhance any assessment. O0294</p> <p>sportscotland considers that special needs, relevant to recreation, include the need to protect natural and cultural heritage from negative recreational impacts, L0301</p>
Other types of information/ other comments Total: 3	J0241Y2		<p>J0208Y1 N0349Y1</p> <p>We consider that it may be difficult to provide meaningful social and economic information at the sub-unit level chosen by SNH since these units are loosely based on landscape prescriptions, rather than the normal administrative units used for data gathering, such as wards, parishes or estates. J0208</p> <p>The structures and mechanisms in the park plans ought to have greater regard for issues on the 'social and economic' agendas, such as affordable housing, and not just those that affect the biodiversity of the area. J0241</p>

Key Issue 5: Specific boundary of the Park. Principles to be used to establish detailed boundary.

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Agree as proposed Total: 32	A0072X1 A0082X1 A0110X1 A0148X3 A015X3 L0041Y2 A0319X1 B0062X2 B0140X3 B0143X3 B0223X2 C0092Y2 C0209Y2 C0353Y2 E0126Y2 J0216Y2 J0241Y2 K0269Y2 L0012Y2	A0298 X4 A0332 X4	A0045Y3 A0059X5 K0042Y3 K0132Y3 K0147Y3 K0165Y1 L0036Y3 N0107Y4 O0068X5 O0192Y3 O0294Y3	<p>The Association considers the approach proposed for the determination of detailed boundaries is soundly based. L0041</p> <p>The principles proposed for establishing the detailed boundary are considered reasonable. C0092</p> <p>The idea of following water catchment etc was seen as good, as was towns/villages being in or out. Private/public land ownership should have no sway. O0294</p> <p>The principles SNH propose to use to establish the detailed boundary of the National Park seem entirely sensible; it is deciding on the appropriate size of the Park that seems more difficult. A0332</p>
Support with additional points or suggestions Total: 37	A0272X3 B0138X3 B0167X1 D0191Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 F0381X3 H0171Y2 H0344Y2 J0093Y2 K0255Y2 L0226Y2 L0260Y2 M0204Y2	A0079 X4 A0155 X4 A0198 X4 A0211 X4 A0340 X4	A0063X5 A0087X5 K0127Y1 A0134X5 A0137X5 K0149Y1 K0151Y1 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 O0176X5 N0203Y1 A0206X5 O0289X5 L0326Y1 A0347X5 J0352Y1 A0387X5 A0083X5	<p>A factor, which would be worth taking into account when establishing the boundaries, would be the movement of red deer over the area. In order to optimise future deer management within the National Park it would be preferred if boundaries could assimilate with red deer movement areas where feasible. A0063</p> <p>One could have a formula along the lines "a line outward from the natural/primary boundary by one kilometre of horizontal distance or one hundred metres of vertical separation, whichever was nearer to the natural/primary boundary, with the rider that if such line were closer than two hundred and fifty metres horizontal distance to a built up area it should be extended outwards to be always at least two hundred and fifty metres horizontal distance from the built up area. L0260 Y2</p> <p>I am in agreement with the principles set out in 3-15 for establishing the detailed boundary of the National Park, but would just add that it might be helpful, if in applying them care, were taken to ensure that the whole of any SSSI or other area designated for scientific reasons near the intended boundary line were either included or excluded. A0137</p> <p>The working principles identified in the consultation document, such as the need to follow administrative boundaries where possible, are sensible, although it is important to emphasise that boundaries should be regarded as 'porous'. This would allow flexibility of approach on the margins. H0171</p>

Disagreement with suggested approach to establish detailed boundary Total: 2	A0342X3	A0020X4		Clear definition of a boundary will cause advantages and disadvantages for those living/working both within and outwith the National Park, leading to divisions rather than integration. A0342
Specific comments on use of administrative boundaries Total: 6	B0348X1 L0260Y2 J0356Y2 E0399Y2		A0087X5 K0366Y1	If one purpose of the National Park is to integrate areas currently under differing administrative control, then it does not make much sense to follow the boundaries of those administrative authorities. A0087 As it is recognised that to work the Park must be community as well as government driven community boundaries should be followed; e.g. school catchment, community council areas. B0348 Parishes should form basis for administrative boundaries. K0366
Specific comments on inclusion or exclusion of towns and villages Total: 12	B0337X1 J0224Y2 K0112Y2 K0184Y2 K0221Y2 M0373Y2		D0129Y3 K0060Y1 K0127Y1 K0170Y1 K0384Y1 L0302Y1	Where possible, gateway villages and towns should be encouraged to sit within the Park. However, where the local community does not want the settlement to be within the Park, this view should be given additional weight in the decision making process. Either way, villages should be wholly in or out of the Park. K0127 We agree with the proposition that all towns and villages must be clearly inside or outside the boundary. K0170
Specific comments on land ownership or land management boundaries Total: 21	A0076X1 A0271X2 A0342X3 B0001X1 B0146Y2 B0337X1 C0142X3 F0381X3 G0157Y2 J0224Y2 J0356Y2 L0260Y2 M0373Y2	A0227 X4	A0183X5 C0306Y1 J0152Y1 J0201Y1 J0208Y1 J0313Y1 K0158Y1	It is important that estate boundaries are used. They do usually follow permanent features but even if not there would be great problems in administering a business partly within and partly without the park area. B0001 I don't agree that land ownership should be excluded as an element in determining the National Park boundary. Surely it makes sense to take account of such social factors. A0076 The administrative nightmare of a small estate or farm, half in and half out of the proposed Park, must be considered. It would be an injustice to impose this upon existing land owners. Ownership may change, but once the boundaries are set out, the purchaser has a clear choice about buying inside or outside or across the park boundary and can make a free decision. Existing owners will have the decision imposed upon them. C0142 We agree that boundaries should be determined without any reference to questions of land-ownership. L0260 Land management operations too can be subject to change, and it is surely the appropriateness of the land in question to the purposes of the Park, and its potential value to that, which is the deciding factor. A0183
Specific comments	A0055X1 A0076X1	A0198 X4	A0017X5 A0044Y3	Where a road passes over a river several times, it might make sense to have the road entirely inside or entirely outside the NP. Cairngorm rivers are just as moveable as roads, actually. So I'd have thought roads

<p>on the use of field boundaries, paths or roads Total: 19</p>	<p>A0097X1 A0272X3 E0104Y2 E0123Y2 E0399Y2 K0255Y2 L0260Y2 L0260Y2</p>		<p>A0131X5 A0232X5 E0246Y3 K0366Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3</p>	<p>as boundaries (outside settlements) perfectly reasonable. e.g. the Lecht. The A9 through Drumochter is a clear boundary dividing E and W Highlands - it's moved its line just twice since General Wade (1740s). A0017</p> <p>I do not accept that a major road is an unacceptable boundary. It is the one most easily recognised by the general public and to all intents and purposes is a permanent feature. In many cases such roads follow natural features. A0055</p> <p>This seems a reasonable approach. However, in respect of a road or track being a possible boundary, where this is adjacent to a loch or river, e.g. at Loch Laggan and Loch Ericht, the intervening area between the road and the loch/river should be included to maintain the holistic character of the area and prevent inappropriate development or activities in the intervening strip. Therefore the inner side of the water feature should be the boundary, and not the road/track. E0104</p> <p>Artificial boundaries, such as roads should be avoided, and we note the reference in the consultation document to this effect. We therefore find it somewhat surprising to that with Option B, the A899 and the A86 have been used as eastern boundaries. A0131</p> <p>It is also possible to disagree with SNH that roads are transient features (as in page 21). Roads in the eastern Cairngorms are, in fact, quite helpful provided they can be interpreted to include say a distance of about one mile or convenient landform beyond the road to which farms and houses are logically connected. E0399</p>
<p>Specific comments on use of permanent natural features, including watersheds Total: 29</p>	<p>A0210X2 C0142X3 H0106Y2 J0261Y2 J0307Y2 J0330Y2 K0112Y2 K0184Y2 K0221Y2 K0255Y2 K0341Y2 K0341Y2 L0260Y2</p>	<p>A0079 X4</p>	<p>A0044Y3 A0052Y3 A0087X5 C0306Y1 G0199Y1 K0127Y1 K0366Y1 K0366Y1 K0384Y1 L0302Y1 L0395Y1 N0304Y1 N0349Y1</p>	<p>Watersheds would serve as pragmatic boundaries in this Park where water quality and the management of diffuse pollution will be important in maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment of the Park. Care should be taken when including water courses so as to ensure inclusion of the associated catchment where feasible. K0127</p> <p>We welcome the proposed emphasis on adopting the use of natural features such as watersheds as the most effective line and not adopting field or ownership boundaries or paths or roads. K0184</p> <p>WWF does recommend that, to be effective in terms of land use management, the boundaries and management units of the Park should be based on river catchments in the area. River catchments provide a logical basis for the effective management of the natural heritage of an area. In addition the impending EU Water Framework Directive will lay the emphasis on catchments as the natural unit of management. K0112</p> <p>The National Park Authority must have the power to control developments such as telecommunications masts on ridges and mountain tops immediately adjacent to the Park boundary. Where a significant peak is on the provisional boundary line we would recommend the boundary being drawn some way down the outside of that mountain, so that the summit and major ridge lines are properly protected within the National Park boundary. L0395</p> <p>The areas to be included/excluded should be based on water catchments. Whatever happens at the head of a catchment effects everything downstream. Land use can affect pollution, sedimentation and water quality</p>

				<p>and quantity. The latter two are crucial elements of the Cairngorms. Community boundaries are also often defined by water catchments. Watercourses would not be used as boundaries if the principle of using catchments were to be followed. C0142</p> <p>In terms of principles upon which the boundary is drawn we urge that, as far as possible, it is drawn along watersheds rather than along roads or the bottom of straths. Following roads or other low ground features will lead to development pressures on land immediately outwith the boundary and this is undesirable. L0302</p>
Scale of mapping of the boundary Total: 1			K0060Y1	The Trust would also advise that the boundary might be publicly presented on a 1:25000 plan, but its detailed determination should be based upon 1:5000 scale plans at the very minimum, and in some areas (such as around settlements), 1:500 scale. This detail would be necessary in case any boundary disputes arose at some future date. K0060
Other comments on boundaries Total: 3	A0182X1 B0396X3		C0051Y3	<p>I am too much at odds with the boundary thing to comment. The boundary should be around a far bigger Highlands and islands designation. C0051</p> <p>We are indifferent to which principle should be adopted for establishing boundaries. B0396</p>

Key Issue 6: Views on whether there are any further powers that could be envisaged for the National Park Authority in the Cairngorms				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for general powers proposed Total: 41	A0072X1 A0110X1 A0180X1 A0219X2 A0271X2 A0342X3 A0382X1 C0092Y2 C0353Y2 E0104Y2 E0126Y2 F0230X2 H0343Y2 J0241Y2 K0184Y2 K0255Y2 K0341Y2 L0041Y2 L0226Y2 L0260Y2	A0037X4 A0040X4 A0079X4 A0198X4 A0298X4	A0024X5 A0059X5 A0159X5 A0183X5 J0152Y1 J0201Y1 K0127Y1 K0132Y3 K0147Y3 K0158Y1 L0036Y3 L0326Y1 M0204Y1 N0107Y4 N0304Y1 O0294Y3	<p>I agree in general terms with the proposed functions and powers of the Park Authority. However, I believe that the Park Authority should have an enhanced role, and therefore enhanced powers, with respect to the highly sensitive central core area, as roughly defined by Area A. Within this area the Park Authority should be directly responsible for planning amongst other things. A0180</p> <p>The powers provided by the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 appear to be sufficient, with other powers which may be conferred as a result of future enactments (e.g. access legislation). F0230</p> <p>We do not feel that there are any further powers that could be envisaged or given to the National Park Authority in the Cairngorms. J0152</p> <p>We would not see the need for further powers, other than to stress that powers available to local authorities under new access legislation should be accorded to the National Park Authority. L0326</p> <p>Excluding the planning function, which is covered in Key Issue 7 below, the summary of key powers in the SNH Consultation Document appear the most relevant for the functions of the National Park Authority particularly in the context of the important land management function. E0126</p> <p>We do not envisage powers over and above those listed in table 2 to be necessary in order for the National Park Authority to function effectively. L0226</p> <p>There are no powers additional to those available which a Cairngorms NPA would need, BUT it does need ALL of them, especially the full powers of a local planning authority. N0107</p>
Support for powers in respect of access and recreation Total: 26	A0030X3 A0049X3 A005#X1 A0163X3 A0322X3 B0146Y2 J0093Y2 J0166Y2 L0041Y2 L0254Y2 L0260Y2	A0079X4 A0295X4	A0016Z A0052Y3 A0057X5 A0090X5 A0164X5 A0177Y4 A0336Z C0306Y1 K0165Y1 K0385Y3 L0302Y1 L0326Y1 N0050Y1	<p>Given that I envisage a relatively small National Park protecting a highly vulnerable natural heritage in the national interest and for all humanity, the authority should have power to regulate and, for certain places at certain times, deny access whatever proposed access legislation says, - not "encourage" people to visit the National Park. A0163</p> <p>The powers quoted appear to be adequate. However it might be appropriate to state in the Park legislation the power to assume local authority responsibilities with regard to access. Some of the additional functions, which attach to local authority planning departments, would be appropriate to transfer to the Park Authority. The work of the project teams in village enhancement, tree preservation orders, path creation and similar duties relate very closely to the reasons for the Park's establishment. The draft access legislation recently published appears to make no mention of National Parks. However, all the responsibilities, which it proposes attaching to local authorities, would more appropriately attach to National Parks where such exist. Thus the Cairngorms National Park legislation should make provision for the Park to assume responsibility for access and the preservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment. A0079</p>

				<p>Bylaws should not be used by the NPA to set restrictions on non-motorised or non-wheeled activities which exceed restrictions that might be applied elsewhere in Scotland. The right to walk or paddle should be safeguarded and not be zoned in either time or place. A0057</p> <p>The TGA agrees that the National Park Authority should have full responsibility for controlling access provided that this is under the terms of the proposed access legislation. It should be made clear that powers to make access and footpath agreements are included. It should also be made clear whether or not the Park Authority will grant aid recreational provision by others or will this remain with SNH. The TGA recognises that responsible access is of paramount importance and strongly linked to the functions of the park, but it should also be fully understood that there are considerable costs associated with management of access. C0306</p> <p>We endorse the need for the National Park to have full responsibility for controlling access provided under terms of the proposed access legislation. Responsible access is of paramount importance and strongly linked to the functions of the Park. We consider that the powers to be granted should be adequate. B0146</p> <p>It should be able to prohibit the use of all terrain vehicles and motorised cycles and bicycles. It should be able to forbid walking in certain areas to allow rehabilitation. A0016</p>
<p>Comments on Ranger Services Total: 10</p>	<p>B0143X3 C0276Y2 F0381X3 J0093Y2 J0261Y2</p>	<p>O0316X4</p>	<p>A0174Y4 A0368X5 L0302Y1 O0294Y3</p>	<p>One other comment I have is that due to the opening of a National Park then this would have the potential for bringing in more visitors to the area. This would be a good thing only if these visitors are being managed properly. For example, what is to be done about the increase in litter? Are the staff on the ground going to have necessary enforcement powers to deal with the problems? I know that Rangers are not known for enforcement, but I feel they should have some power to help them do their job more efficiently. A0174</p> <p>Rangers - As much of the resources of the park as possible should be devoted to providing ranger staff. Tourists much prefer people to interpretation panels. Existing ranger services should be supported and co-ordinated as much as possible. O0316</p> <p>The number of rangers in the area should be significantly increased to deal with National Park designation and the new access legislation. It is strongly felt that Rangers are the single best way to ensure any National Park designation is a success on the ground. O0294</p>
<p>Support for fair, effective bylaws Total: 5</p>	<p>B0143X3</p>		<p>A0232X5 L032Y1 A0174Y4</p>	<p>Bylaws and other regulatory rules ... should not be used to set restrictions that exceed restrictions that exist elsewhere in Scotland. Bylaws are a draconian power if applied to non motorised recreation and deserve to be treated with a light hand. Bearing in mind that bylaws represent a removal of rights from the public and transgressors are liable to criminal prosecution, the need for wide consultation is imperative. L0326</p>
<p>Support for land acquisition powers Total: 4</p>	<p>D0169Y2</p>		<p>A0057X5 A0275X5 L0326Y1</p>	<p>I would like to see the NPA use these powers to compulsorily purchase small units of land at places which can ensure public access to waterways and for the NPA to provide safe parking facilities at such sites. This removes the potential for interference with the right of access and also conflict with local interests arising because of the need for recreationalists to leave a car at the access point ... A0057</p>
<p>Support for incentives</p>	<p>A0236X2 F0381X3</p>		<p>J0352Y1 K0127Y1</p>	<p>The only additional power conferred on the National Park Authority should be that of delivery of funding for a Cairngorm wide dedicated, fully funded agri-environment scheme. A0236</p>

<p>for land owners and managers to aid park aims Total: 22</p>	<p>G0157Y2 J0073Y2 J0093Y2 J0093Y2 J0166Y2 J0166Y2 J0216Y2 J0356Y2 K0112Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 L0254Y2</p>		<p>K0127Y1 K0149Y1 K0154Y1 K0384Y1 L0302Y1 O0176X5</p>	<p>Payments in the 2001 Rural Stewardship scheme are improvements on previous schemes. It is vital that the NPA has sufficient financial resources adequately to subsidise potential entrants to a stewardship scheme in the National Park. Codes of practice on similar lines should be applied to all activities within the Park. All should be agreed between the NPA and local people. Minimum standards combined with adequate subsidy should be a prerequisite and a reward for inclusion within the park. Some changes could lead to reductions in income of landowners or farmers, particularly where incomes were subsidised previously under other grant schemes. O0176</p> <p>Given the key role that farming and land management practices play in shaping and management of this Park's environment, RSPB Scotland submits that the Park Plan should inform the development of distinctive agri-environment initiatives for the Park Area. These initiatives could be delivered via the usual SERAD mechanisms or as with a number of parks elsewhere in Europe, the schemes could be developed and administered by the Park Authority. The advantage of the latter is that Park staff could provide local advice, monitoring and promotion of a scheme tailored to deliver the objectives of the Park Plan. K0127</p> <p>It should be possible for the National Park Authority to provide top-up grants to improve on existing grant schemes within the National Park. J0073</p> <p>It is essential that the NPA has positive incentive powers as well as regulatory powers to complement and be additional to e.g. the Rural Stewardship Scheme and other agri-environment schemes and forestry grants. K0255</p> <p>The ability to request and encourage landowners and managers to adopt management practice which are consistent with the National Park Plan. L0254</p>
<p>General support for powers to control development activities exempt from planning control (e.g. telecoms; power lines; forestry; agricultural buildings; hill tracks; muirburn;</p>	<p>A0030X3 F0381X3 E0123Y2 E0399Y2 J0093Y2 K0221Y2 K0255Y2</p>	<p>A0091X4 A0186X4 A0237X4 A0328X4</p>	<p>A0016Z A0034Z A0179Y4 A0369X5 A0387X5 G0199Y1 G0199Y1 K0154Y1 K0165Y1 L0395Y1 1</p>	<p>Forestry does not come under democratic scrutiny in the same way as most planning and I would like to see the setting up of the Park creating an opportunity for the Board to have a planning control on forestry operations and future plans. F0381</p> <p>Separate from the management of town and country planning issues is the need to ensure that management of various land uses, principally agricultural and forestry activities, within the Park area can be adequately influenced to ensure the maintenance or restoration of activities necessary for the protection, enhancement or re-establishment of the landscapes and habitats upon which the Park's value is based. Linking with the Local Biodiversity Action Plan provides one mechanism for influencing the provisions of agri-environmental money but this is a small component of the total sum provided to agriculture in the Park area. The influence that the Park Authority will be able to have upon agricultural activity is not entirely clear but needs to be addressed for those practices which may currently be damaging, or have the potential to damage, the Park environment. G0199</p> <p>The National Park Authority should have influence over ...power lines and telecommunications where they pass through the Park. The National Park Authority should have influence over permitted development and other legislation relating to forestry, agriculture, buildings, hill tracks etc. K0154</p>

<p>overgrazing; forestry; pipelines) Total: 21</p>				<p>The control over forestry proposals should be the subject of determination by the Park Authority such as felling licences and woodland grant applications to bring a cohesive management to the balance between the forestation, deer management, recreation, tourism and landscape and natural habitat considerations. This is already Aberdeenshire Council policy that forestry operations should be part of some degree of democratic control possibly by the use of the prior notification system and certainly, in this sensitive area , this type of control should be vested with the National Park Authority. E0399</p> <p>It is our view that the NPA must have powers to address all land and water management issues in the area including farming, forestry, water, sporting, fisheries, access, statutory utilities and mobile phone mast erection. The objectives for these issues must be in the Park Plan, the NPA must be a statutory consultee of all relevant Agencies and must be able to enforce a reference to Scottish Ministers in cases where the appropriate authority is minded to proceed contrary to the advice of the NPA. K0255</p>
<p>Calls for the NPA to be a statutory consultee on land management matters Total: 6</p>	<p>J0073Y2 J0093Y2 K0112Y2</p>		<p>G0086Y1 K0384Y1 N203Y1</p>	<p>We would anticipate inviting the National Park to become a "statutory consultee" in relation to forestry proposals, in the same way that local authorities are already statutory consultees. This could apply whether or not the Park had planning powers; but if the Park did have planning powers, we would expect our consultation with local authorities to focus on matters, such as roads and timber transport, for which they retained responsibility, consulting the Park directly on all other relevant matters. We would welcome the opportunity to participate in a collaborative ranger service.G0086</p> <p>It would appear useful to allow the National Park to be a statutory consultee on land management issues within the Forestry Commission, Deer Commission, Fishery boards, and regarding farm grant allocations within the National Park area. J0073</p>
<p>Support for use of management orders in respect to land management and deer control Total: 11</p>	<p>A0055X1 D0191Y2 K0221Y2 L0254Y2</p>	<p>A0108X4</p>	<p>A0164X5 K0149Y1 K0385Y3 L0301Y1 A0045Y3 O0289X5</p>	<p>It is much to be regretted that the primary legislation contains no last resort powers for the application of Management Orders, where all attempts to secure agreement with land managers on beneficial management practices fail. This situation is in contrast to the Scottish Executive's recent proposals in respect of SSSIs. A0108</p> <p>There are two areas excluded in the list of powers which I perceive as key, depending on the area included in the future Cairngorms National Park, which are forestry and agriculture. Invariably a National Park Authority for the Cairngorms that is set to achieve the objectives stated in the document will need to perform functions in these areas. But whether these powers are directly attributed to the NPA, or instead other mechanisms are established to co-ordinate and to ensure that the NPA has certain influence in the policy in these areas, is another matter. In the latter case I think it is important to ensure that the NPA has a role in these areas, whether it is through the Management Plan or binding reporting procedures, or else this "coherent framework to attend the special needs", will not exist. The relevance of the funding in these areas is quite an important method of influencing the use of the land for agricultural and forestry purposes. O0289.</p> <p>Very important as power of Park. Land with nature designations must be well managed, and not allowed to become a museum. Other agreements must be transparent to promote public confidence. D0191</p> <p>The Park Authority should have the last resort power to make "Land Management Orders", requiring an owner to adopt management practices which are consistent with the policies of the National Park Plan. Since the</p>

				most prevalent and damaging management practices concern the control of red deer numbers it is argued that powers to make "Deer Management Orders" should be available to the Park Authority, as a last resort. K0385
Support for powers of the NPA regarding deer management Total: 3		A0220X4 A0237X4	J0070Y1	<p>The National Park Authority in the Cairngorms ought to have the power, held by the Deer Commission in other parts of Scotland, to deal with the deer problem. They should have the power, in the interests of ecological protection and restoration, to demand and implement deer culls and reduction of deer numbers. In their current numbers, red deer are causing considerable continuing damage to native plant communities. A0220</p> <p>The proposal to prepare a National Park Plan is also welcome. At present, there are a number of deer management plans, at various management levels and different stages of development, within the proposed area. The DCS recommends that the proposed National Park Plan incorporates a strategic National Park Deer Management Plan and takes into account and builds on existing deer management plans. J0070</p>
Calls for powers in respect of social and economic development (including housing and tourism) Total: 8	A0030 X3 A0054Y2 F0381 X3 D0191 Y2 D0327Y2 E0123 Y2 J0166 Y2		J0208 Y1	<p>The National Park Authority should be solving some of the problems facing rural communities and be able to encourage local business and enterprise developments but not only within the sphere of tourism. A0030</p> <p>The National Park Authority will have powers to promote the Park area. The relationship between these marketing powers must be considered at an early stage to avoid unnecessary duplication. As with information provision, our recommendation will be that this function should be handled by ATBs as the specialist public sector tourism marketing agencies. This is also in the context of the Scottish Executive desire through the National Tourism Strategy for cross-boundary activity. A0054</p> <p>More assistance for existing local businesses should be required, as well as promoting new businesses. No competition with local businesses - Park's role should be promotion and marketing. Power to promote green tourism initiatives and use of local products, e.g. timber.... Park should have the power to ensure that second home owners pay a levy to the Park, to go some way towards controlling house price increases with desirability of home ownership in a national park. D0191</p> <p>Must have power to provide a solution to affordable housing and to improving infrastructure like roads and transport. High standards have funding implications - need substantial core funding to satisfy needs. D0327</p> <p>Some farmers on the area would like to take advantage of the National Park label to sell their products at a premium, and would like assistance from the Park Authority on the setting up of a co-operative to develop, package and market products. Additional funds would be needed to support niche marketing using "the Park" as a trade mark to a sell whole range of products, some agricultural, some from others sectors e.g. forestry. J0166</p>
Support for powers in respect to traffic management and transport planning	D0191Y2 E0123Y2	A0237X4	A0016Z A0137Y4 A0164X5 K0154Y1 K0384Y1 N0203Y1	<p>I feel that the new National Park Authority should be seen substantially to employ people to work on the ground, and that creation of a subsidy of public transport should figure strongly in the work of the park. A0164</p> <p>Must have power to provide a solution to affordable housing and to improving infrastructure like roads and transport. High standards have funding implications - need substantial core funding to satisfy needs. D0191</p> <p>Other powers which might be considered could be in relation to forestry and agriculture in terms of guidelines, targeted grants etc., and traffic reduction and promoting alternative forms of transport. E0123</p>

Total: 9				
Support for the preparation of a LBAP Total: 10	J0073Y2 J0093Y2 K0255Y2		A0164X5 K0127Y1 K0147Y3 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 K0165Y1 N0050Y1	<p>The Park Authority must be given explicit responsibility and resources for the preparation, co-ordination and delivery of a Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the Park Area. This plan should act as a component of the eventual Park Plan. Other components may include: Catchment Plans; an Access Plan; and a scheme of management initiatives. We therefore visualise the Park Plan as an amalgamation of a number of documents that are added to the Park Plan portfolio as approved by the Park Authority. K0127</p> <p>The proposed National Park Authority should be responsible statutorily for preparing its own action plan as part of the Local Plan process and should give priority to the production of an audit of species and habitat priorities within the proposed National Park area. N0050</p> <p>We would also argue that the National Park Authority should be required to adapt and then adopt the existing Cairngorms Biodiversity Action Plan, and should be given a statutory duty to observe this BAP in all its activities. K0147</p>
Support for powers in respect to cultural heritage Total: 5	E0123Y2 K0255Y2	A0004X4	A0150Y1 K0165Y1	<p>I would stress the importance of the Park authority maintaining a sites and monument record, which of necessity would require an archaeologist within the staffing structure. This would be essential for effective development control and for educational and interpretation work with respect to the cultural heritage. Consideration should also be given to combining SMR with biological and natural history records to create a cultural database. A0004</p> <p>The powers in relation to built heritage and archaeology need to be clarified. E0123</p>
Support for powers in respect to education and interpretation Total: 3	K0112Y2 J0166Y2		A0232X5	<p>The consultation document proposes that the NPA should have powers to provide information, education and facilities to promote the area. WWF sees the role of learning in the National Park as being much wider than simply interpretation of the area. We see learning as being an essential part of the process of meeting the 'special needs of the area'. If the Park is to be managed sustainably, with a balanced achievement of economic, environmental and social aims, as well as with the full participation of stakeholders in the area, then there is a need for a systematic 'learning needs assessment' of the area and its communities. Such an assessment and subsequent programmes to meet the identified needs would help to develop greater understanding of the economic, social, cultural, political and environmental processes at play in the area, which would in turn allow people to better balance the different objectives sustainably. K0112</p>
Support for other specific powers or functions Total: 10	B0348X1 C0092Y2	A0079X4 A0020X4	A0232X5 A0387X5 A0177Y4 A0016Z J0208Y1 K0154Y1	<p>The Park Authority should be given powers to prohibit or to require another agency to prohibit over-flights by flying machines and balloons.....It should be able to prohibit the use of motorised water propulsion. A0016</p> <p>A Park Authority or other option such as a joint committee should have all such funding powers, so that there is a single gateway for all applicants and a single decision-making body to prevent conflict and waste. A Park Authority or joint committee would decide about grant applications after taking appropriate technical advice from other agencies. It would be simple from these agencies to have the same officers involved, with special expertise in problems in the Cairngorms area. A0020</p> <p>Reduce noise of portable radio and phone; reduced parking fee for caravans coloured dark green or navy. A0177</p>

				<p>I would like to see a Park Board that is essentially a Local Authority for the area. As it would not be efficient to run many services for the small populated area that I wish to be included, some services should be retained with the existing LA's. These will mainly be in the surrounding area and will include education, roads, housing, refuse and social services. The detail of the division of powers needs much work.</p> <p>A0387</p> <p>Park powers would be a barrier to achievement of the Park Board's primary role, which is to bring all the communities of interest to work together to standards which match the qualities of an area of such outstanding International Importance. This can only be achieved by leadership through community planning. Legal powers would never be enough and their use would be likely to produce very slow results, eventually winning battles, but at the cost of losing the vision. It is unrealistic to think that the Park Board itself could have all the knowledge, powers and funding to achieve the four aims in a balanced way throughout the area. Whether it has its own legal powers or not, the reality is that achievement will be gained through influencing other organisations and individuals. This is best achieved by focussing on leadership through the promotion of and support for community. B0348</p>
Disagree with proposed powers (or aspects of them) e.g. compulsory purchase powers Total: 13	A0097X1 A0272X3 A0273X3 B0062X2 B0337X1 B0337X1 B0337X1 B140X3 C0142X3 L0039Y2		A0025X5 L0326Y1 A0052Y3	<p>The power gathered by a National Park Authority must be limited, even so within that limited power most of the authority should remain with the Local Authority. No additional level of authority is wanted as the mere mention of Powers of "Land Acquisition" send the local population into shell shock. On top of that, the thought of additional taxes, such as service and facilities taxes, together with a tourist tax or whatever, only add to the general concern about the overall situation. A0097</p> <p>Management agreements should be voluntary agreements not imposed regulations. Bylaws and Rules should be avoided where possible. If they are used they should be ratified by the democratically elected local authority. The Park administration should be a service not an Authority. B0337</p> <p>The powers proposed in Table 2 are more than adequate. In particular I see no need for the power to purchase or manage land. The powers to own and manage land in the public interest are already granted to SNH and the Forestry Commission. There is no reason why the issue should be made more complex by allowing the Park Authority to duplicate the administrative expense. The proposed Park Authority's job will be to deal with policies and incentives. Land management would be best left to bodies with existing experience. C0142</p>
Queries regarding application of proposed powers Total: 6	B0223X2 A0314X3 D0129X3 L0027Y2	A0044X4	G0199Y1	<p>How are bylaws to be enforced? What legal powers will be available to the Ranger service to enforce bylaws? B0223</p> <p>It should be clear that powers to make access and footpath agreements are included. Can the Park Authority grant aid recreational provision by others or will this remain with SNH? How will the priorities of the Park Authority in this respect be harmonised? A0044</p> <p>Gliding is non intrusive and what better way is there to appreciate the natural beauty of the air than from a glider soaring gently over Lochnagar, or the Cairngorms. We would propose that in recognition of this, that in box 1 on page 16 of the proposal, that the words "and in the air" be added after "on land and water" on line 7</p>

				of the second paragraph. We also would ask that you confirm that it is not your intention to restrict or stop the launching and flying of gliders in the proposed Cairngorms National Park. L0027
--	--	--	--	---

Key Issue 7: The merits of Scottish Ministers' preferred option for the planning function remaining with the local authorities, the alternative option for under which the National Park Authority would become the planning authority, with the local authorities given rights as statutory consultees; and any other options which could be considered.

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for LA's to remain as planning authorities Total: 91	A0015X3 A0054Y2 A0148X3 A0163X3 A0172X1 A0182X1 A0219X2 A0236X2 A0271X2 A0272X3 A0278X1 A0312X2 A0315X1 A0322X3 A0342X3 A0355X1 A0370X1 B0001X1 B0138X3 B0140X3 B0143X3 B0146Y2 B0167X1 B0223X2 B0287Y2 B0324X2 B0337X1 B0348X1 B0396X3 C0092Y2 C0142X3 C0209Y2 C0276Y2 C0288Y2 C0309Y2	A0065X4 A0079X4 A0185X4 A0227X4 A0284X4 A0298X4 A0367X4 D0354X4	A0059X5 A0063X5 A0083X5 A0090X5 A0134X5 A0159X5 A0160X5 A0233X5 A0296X5 A0297X5 B0077Y3 C0306Y1 C0397Y3 E0145Y3 J0208Y1 J0352Y1 M0204Y1 N0194Y1 N0304Y1 O0007Y3 O0192Y3 O0289X5	<p>While Development Control is best left for the Local Authorities, it would be important for the Cairngorms National Park Authority to be, at the very least, an equal partner with them regarding policy. We suggest that there is a single local plan for the Cairngorms containing consistent policies and high control standards for all the Authorities to implement and follow. A0172</p> <p>The planning function should remain with the local authorities. The planning issues that arise generally have more to do with local authority functions than with matters of concern to a National Park Authority. Local authorities should be required to consult the Park Authority on only these matters of importance to the National Park. A0227</p> <p>There is a feeling that Park Authorities in England fossilise everything after designation. I see no reason why designation should change the present planning regime, whereby the Local Authority have sensible rules, provided they stick to them...I support the preferred option for the Planning function to remain with the Local Authorities, and the Park's role as consultee should be confined to just that. There can be no justification for further restrictions to be placed on the following designation. B0167</p> <p>Planning should remain a Local Authority function. The NPA should be deeply involved in the creation of the Local Plans... It seems logical that every step is taken to avoid duplication of effort. To this end, and to retain democratic accountability, it is sensible that planning remains a Local Authority function. The NPA should be deeply involved in the creation of the Local Plans which should, of course, include the sections of the Park Plan which are relevant to the Local Authority area. B0138</p> <p>It would be undemocratic for planning powers to be vested in the proposed Park Authority unless and until it becomes a totally elected body. It is a point of principle that planning bodies should be fully accountable. C0142</p> <p>The Timber Growers' Association considers that the planning responsibilities should remain with the existing local authorities. If option A for the National Park area is accepted (ie the core area) then only three local authorities would be involved. Planning powers should remain with the elected local authorities and the proposed Park Authority should be a statutory consultee. C0306</p> <p>We would favour planning powers being left with Angus Council in this area, subject to the Park Authority being a statutory consultee for all applications relating to this area. Transfer of planning powers would be likely to lead to confusion and would undermine the effective joint working which has been achieved between the Cairngorms Partnership and neighbouring local authorities. D0354</p>

<p>C0353Y2 D0129X3 D0169Y2 D0191Y2 D0202Y2 D0327Y2 E0080Y2 E0104Y2 E0123Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 F0381X3 H0106Y2 H0171Y2 H0343Y2 H0344Y2 J0166Y2 J0216Y2 J0224Y2 J0241Y2 J0307Y2 K0105Y2 L0268Y2 L0321Y2 M0248Y2</p>				<p>Existing planning powers should be retained by Local Authorities in order to ensure local democratic accountability. Planning research commissioned by the Cairngorms Partnership in 1998 confirmed that there was convergence of Local Plan policies between the Local Planning Authorities and an analysis of planning applications indicated a very close fit between development control decisions and planning policies. E0104</p> <p>The alternative option of the National Park Authority becoming the planning authority is not considered to be viable for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The Cairngorms area is currently covered by 5 Structure Plans and 6 Local Plans. In terms of Structure Plans the NPA may choose to prepare 1 structure plan or take part in joint structure planning arrangements with the local authorities. For Local Plans, it is likely that the NPA would prepare one Local Plan for the whole area. All aspects of development control would be carried out by the NPA. In terms of Staffing the NPA could employ their own staff or utilise local authority staff on an agency basis or through Service Level Agreements. The disadvantages of a full transfer of planning powers to the NPA are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Planning decisions would be undertaken by a body which is not fully democratically accountable. Elected local authority members would lose the right to represent their constituents on planning matters.. -A specific structure and Local Plan for the Cairngorms could be perceived as duplicating the work on the preparation of a National Park Plan. The local plan would cover a relatively large and diverse area which would be subject to limited development pressure. -The planning functions, particularly the development control casework would be very time consuming and may have only limited direct input to the strategic aims of the National Park Plan. -It is very unlikely that the NPA could offer specialist advice on listed buildings, archeology etc, and this would have to be delivered on an agency basis by local authorities. -Close working arrangements between development control officers, planning policy officers and building control officers will be lost.E0123 <p>The Cairngorms Local Authority Group submitted a detailed paper on the issue of Planning Powers to Scottish Natural Heritage which supports the Scottish Ministers preferred option for the planning function remaining with the local authorities. The advantages of this option are:- Delivery of the planning function would continue to reflect the settlement pattern of the Cairngorms area and the relationship between communities and facilities required, which extend well beyond the National Park area....The alternative option of the National Park Authority becoming the planning authority is not considered to be viable for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The Cairngorms area is currently covered by 5 Structure Plans and 6 Local Plans. In terms of Structure Plans the NPA may choose to prepare 1 structure plan or take part in joint structure planning arrangements with the local authorities. For Local Plans, it is likely that the NPA would prepare one Local Plan for the whole area. All aspects of development control would be carried out by the NPA. In terms of Staffing the NPA could employ their own staff or utilise local authority staff on an agency basis or through Service Level Agreements. E0123The main statutory planning functions should remain with the democratically elected, local and accountable local authorities, especially when the location of the boundary of the Park is presently unknown. This would give equity to electors with and outwith the Park within a local authority area, and avoid an additional layer of bureaucracy. Most planning applications relate to developments within or adjacent to settlements, and are of a minor nature. They are assessed against the policies of the local authority development plans, which have been approved by the Scottish Executive and contain the relative Government</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>guidelines. There is a strong convergence of policies across all five local authority development plans in the Cairngorms area, because of overview by the Scottish Executive, and studies have shown that there is also a high degree of compliance between the plan policies and the decisions of planning committees. F0230</p> <p>We agree that planning powers in the Park area should remain with the local planning authorities. There is no evidence of any current failure to deliver a level of care in handling planning issues which is appropriate to the special circumstances of a national park. H0343</p> <p>The Forum's consensus opinion is that local authorities should retain all planning powers, as any deviation away from this would lead to over-bureaucracy and time loss. The suggested option of co-option of Park Authority members onto local planning committees for issues affecting the Park could be a good idea. Farmers within the National Park should not be disadvantaged when submitting planning applications, and any extra compliances set on applications within the Park would have to be fully compensated. J0166</p> <p>We are generally happy with the way the Cairngorms Partnership and Councils have co-operated over issues. Our Discussion Paper supports the existing situation, stating the view that planning control decisions must remain publicly accountable and should thus be retained by the existing local authorities, although the national Park Service should become a statutory consultee. We also consider that the National Park Service would have an important role alongside local authorities in helping local communities to become more involved in the planning process thereby ensuring that their views are heard and incorporated. J208</p> <p>Pitlochry Civic Trust considers that the relative Local Authorities should retain their full planning function. This would be a cheaper and more effective solution, with direct involvement by the local Councillors. K0105</p> <p>We support the concept that planning powers should remain with the relevant local authorities although we would expect that the Park Authority would be closely involved and consulted on any application sensitive to the special qualities of the Park area. L0268</p> <p>SCDI concurs with a very strong opinion identified throughout the proposed area that the local authorities should remain the planning authorities of a National Park in the Cairngorms. This recommendation is reinforced by the existing good co-ordination in planning agreements between the local authorities concerned, which provide consistency in development control and planning policies. The alternative of the National Park Authority becoming the planning authority is not an option that SCDI would recommend. However, good co-ordination between the local authorities and the NPA in the planning process is essential and they should meet regularly to agree mutually related policies. M204</p> <p>The Forum agrees that the Planning powers should stay within the existing local authorities but would recommend that the National Park Authority have an overall view of all proposed development within the Park. M0248</p> <p>Of particular concern to members are the proposals for the operation of the planning functions. Members support the basis of SNH's advice to Government published in 1999, that the local authorities should remain the planning authorities under the terms of the Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. However, the</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>NPA should be a statutory consultee. The Executive Committee considers that the case for transferring planning powers from the existing planning authorities has not been justified. N0194</p> <p>There are two very important reasons for supporting the alternative of the planning function remaining with the local authority. The first of these is that, considering the nature of this national park, it would be important to concentrate the expertise of the staff in the protection of the environmental and cultural heritage. Although this may not be so apparent, a great degree of the influence that a Park's authority (and staff) has, comes because of the fact that it is the main holder of environmental and heritage information. It is thus importance to focus on this role. // A second, and fundamental reason, is the need to keep the balance with decisions which should be taken at a local level by the authority democratically elected (made by the local authority). It is necessary to respect the sphere of decisions that correspond to the local level and that should be done by an authority democratically elected. Even if the NPA has some directly elected representatives, it could not fulfil this role. This does not imply that there should not be certain mechanisms to ensure that the NPA opinion is taken into account as regards certain developments (particularly if they may have negative effects on the environmental or cultural heritage).O0289.</p>
Support for NPA to become planning authority Total 154	A0030X3 A0049X3 A0055X1 A0066X1 A0072X1 A0076X1 A0078X1 A0082X1 A0095X2 A0103X1 A0110X1 A0141X1 A0163X3 A0173X1 A0210X2 A0213X1 A0242X1 A0267X2 A0319X1 A0329X1 A0371X1 A0382X1 B0062X2 D0096Y2 D0181Y2 J0073Y2 J0261Y2 J0287Y2	A0004X4 A0044X4 A0091X4 A0099X4 A0101X4 A0108X4 A0139X4 A0155X4 A0186X4 A0198X4 A0200X4 A0205X4 A0211X4 A0215X4 A0228X4 A0234X4 A0238X4 A0240X4 A0247X4 A0265X4 A0274X4 A0277X4 A0280X4 A0283X4 A0308X4 A0334X4 A0363X4 A0364X4	A0010X5 A0016Z A0017X5 A0024X5 A0034Z A0045Y3 A0052Y3 A0061Y4 A0087X5 A0088X5 A0124X5 A0128X5 A0131X5 A0137Y4 A0150Y4 A0164X5 A0179Y4 A0183X5 A0206X5 A0231Y4 A0243Y4 A0244Y4 A0245X5 A0249Y4 A0250X5 A0251X5 A0257Y4 A0262Y4	<p>I have suggested that the area I have delineated should comprise the whole of the park. At the very least it should be a specially protected part of the Park. I want to suggest that the Park authority be given full planning powers over this area whether it comprises the whole of the park or only part of it. Ideally there should be published guidelines, which make it clear that certain developments will not be permitted in the area. A0016</p> <p>If the National Park does not have direct planning responsibility and only a body of consultation it will be negative influence on developments practice, the controversial ones and it may be difficult to provide positive guidance. A0030</p> <p>I can find little merit in the proposal by Scottish Ministers and SNH that the planning function should remain with the Local Authorities. Indeed, I am considerably alarmed by the level of "official" commitment to this proposal in advance of any proper public debate or consultation. A0055</p> <p>It is fundamentally illogical to argue in the case of Loch Lomond for the Park to have planning powers and suggest the reverse for the Cairngorms. The argument that making the Park Authority the planning authority "would provide for an integrated and more focused approach to the planning issues in the area" is equally valid for the Cairngorms as it is for Loch Lomond. Without planning powers, the Park Authority will lack authority and not be able to provide the planning and management framework which is required. Experience in England has demonstrated the need for these powers for Parks to be effective and these have therefore been conferred on those areas which did not initially have them following the 1949 act. A0044</p> <p>NPA should be the planning authority with LAs as statutory consultees. This is the key issue determining whether the NPA exercises effective control over the area it will be set up to conserve-because it is an essential tool for the discharge of that primary responsibility on which all else depends. The alternatives offer a prospect of confusion and conflict. Nor am I persuaded by the argument about extra staff and costs ; in the alternative worst cases (s) the NPA would have to have in-house expertise to fight its corner effectively anyway. We should expect higher standards in a National Park than is presently evident around, for example, Aviemore, Cairngorm, Glen Shee and the Lecht. A0072</p>

<p>K0112Y2 K0184Y2 K0197Y2 K0222Y2 K0341Y2 L0012Y2 L0041Y2 L0226Y2 L0254Y2 L0260Y2 M0373Y2</p>	<p>A0391X4 O0316X4</p>	<p>A0263X5 A0270X5 A0281Y4 A0282Y4 A0285X5 A0293X5 A0310Y4 A0318X5 A0325X5 A0335X5 A0339Y4 A0346X5 A0347X5 A0350Y4 A0369X5 A0374X5 A0375X5 A0379X5 A0380Y4 A0383X5 A0387X5 A0392Y4 A0401Y4 C0081X5 C0378Y3 E0246Y3 G0199Y1 K0042 Y3 K0060Y1 K0127Y1 K0144Y3 K0147Y3 K0149Y1 K0151Y1 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 K0165Y1 K0239Y1 K0299X5 K0345Y1 K0385Y3 L0036Y3 L0156Y4</p>	<p>Full planning powers are essential for an independent authority that needs to take the lead in sustainable development. There is a naïve assumption in the proposal document that all the constituent Councils are like minded. This is far from the case as can be ascertained from a brief examination of current development plans. If local authorities were to retain responsibility for planning functions there is an almost guaranteed 10 years ahead of confusion, joint committees, referrals to Scottish Ministers and, most importantly of all, a diminution in the heritage value the National Park should be protecting. I cannot conceive of any argument that is put forward for retention of the planning function by the existing local authorities that can stand up against the logical arrangement and experience of NPAs elsewhere in Britain. Admittedly only one park in England and Wales takes full responsibility for producing a structure plan but all ten parks have the powers to do so. A0155</p> <p>The park Authority must have control over all developments inside the Park, regardless of who owns the land. Otherwise what is the point of having a park? The Park Authority should have full planning powers. If the planning function remains with local authorities there will be conflicts of interest. The prime purpose of local authorities is not the protection and conservation of the land, which should be the prime purpose of the park. If the PA has full planning powers then it can put in place a detailed plan for the whole of the Cairngorms and carry this out. A0210</p> <p>It is utterly crucial that the new National Park Authority has FULL planning powers. The track record of Local Authorities in exercising this function, has resulted in lamentable and irreversible damage to the fragile montane habitat. Clearly, a Planning Authority with specialist knowledge is required. This would appear to be on offer as far as Loch Lomond is concerned and it has always been the norm in English National parks. Why on earth should the Cairngorms be any different? A0250</p> <p>A strong National Park Authority with full planning powers should be established to ensure consistency and provide the legislative basis necessary to achieve the long-term conservation and enhancement of the Cairngorms. A0283</p> <p>The National Park Authority should be its own planning authority with a separate structure plan superseding any local authority plans previously drawn up. The structure plan will need to be separate but integral with the local authority plans to transport, roads, water and services are co-ordinated. B0062</p> <p>Power over planning is the crucial power of such an authority. C0081</p> <p>On the question of planning powers within the Park a majority considered that the Park Authority should hold the power of dealing with planning matters. D0181</p> <p>The alternative would be for the National Park Authority to become the planning authority, at least for local planning and development control functions. One of the principle functions of the Park Authority will be to</p>
--	----------------------------	---	---

		<p>L0161Y3 L0189Y3 L0301Y1 L0372Y1 L0395Y1 N0050Y1 N0203Y1 N0300Y1 N0349Y1 O0002X5 O0051Y3 O0068X5 O0176X5 O0294Y3</p>	<p>conserve and enhance the special landscape qualities of the designated area. Even small buildings, inappropriately sited or designed, can have a significant impact on the landscape. Having development control powers would greatly facilitate the ability of the Park Authority to fulfil its key functions. E0246</p> <p>By contrast to the proposed option, SEPA would advocate that the National Park Authority should have powers to prepare Development Plans, take development control decisions and undertake other planning functions (Tree Preservation Orders etc.). It is considered that this approach would offer a number of particular merits and represents the best environmental option....// SEPA's interest is in securing a planning policy framework within the Park that most effectively enable environmental protection and enhancement and, accordingly, it considers that the assumption of planning powers by the National Park Authority represents the best environmental option. G0199.</p> <p>Members generally did not agree with the Scottish Executive on the issue of planning powers. Comments included that the provision of planning powers to the National Park Authority was the only manageable option, and that the detail of the difference of approach between different sets of planners in the constituent authorities suggested a single attitude was needed. It was pointed out that the provision to the National Park of a real power such as planning would serve to concentrate attention on an area which was peripheral to all the authorities which at present hold that power. It would also be possible to grade the operation of this power according to the zones of a National Park Plan. It was also pointed out that if it was to initiate a National Park Plan, the National Park would therefore have a planning function.J0073</p> <p>This issue is critical for the Trust. We disagree with the proposal for the planning function to remain with the local authorities involved. Past example in England in the early days of national parks showed clear difficulties where the Park Authority spanned several local authority boundaries. It soon became clear that joint working between planning authorities was unworkable, and Park Authorities were made into planning authorities as well. K0060</p> <p>Strategic and local land use planning are core issues for an NPA which will in any case have a view on the effects of human development on nationally significant heritage. Such a process requires detailed effort in devising appropriate policies and in applying them on the ground. This is currently not available within existing planning authorities and even if it were and it could be wholly applied to the National Park, there still remains the difficulty of policy integration amongst the constituent authorities. The option of leaving the planning role to these authorities would be, in our view, ineffective, inefficient and more expensive to the national purse in the long run.// ...The inevitable outcome arising from a differentiation into retention of the planning function by existing authorities and the NPA as statutory consultee would be that the NPA would be seen to play a negative, anti-development role to the lead authorities on an issue of crucial importance to the well being of the National Park.// The Council's response is as follows: 1) Existing models in Britain. Experience elsewhere in Britain has demonstrated conclusively that NPAs (operating in a similar framework of local government) have functioned more effectively when they are independent bodies with full planning powers....// 2) The co-option of NPA members onto planning committees of constituent authorities. This approach presents a number of fundamental problems, not the least of which is the permanent minority of NPA representation, invoked by such a provision. // 3) The joint preparation of a Local (Subject) Plan. This gives the NPA a very limited input into land use decisions and leaves it in the minor role of statutory consultee on strategic issues and development</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>control.// 4) Delegation of powers for Local Plan preparation and Development Control. This would be at the behest of the individual planning authorities. It could result in a very complicated situation if different authorities offered different levels of delegation....K0149</p> <p>We urge SNH to recommend that the NPA should become the planning authority for the NP, with the local authorities given rights as statutory consultees. We firmly believe the NPA should be responsible for structure and local planning and for development control, with additional responsibility for subject plans as appropriate (perhaps forestry, minerals) and the LBAP. // In a scenario whereby the local authorities were to retain planning powers, the NP would be covered by five different structure plans, and a large number of local and subject plans-at a guess 15-20. A quick trawl of a sample of current plans illustrates the problems this scenario would throw up - plans at different stages, contrasting policies on countryside, recreation, environment etc. and plans with a presumption in favour of economic development. //...A single structure plan, local plan, and a set of development control policies and design guides appropriate to the NP must be the way forward, of course with the NPA consulting the LAs. In the case of development control only applications of significance should be the subject of consultation with the relevant LA. K0158</p> <p>...planning powers can no longer remain with the decision making authorities...This applies to all planning powers. It is asserted that there are a "relatively small number of development proposals that the area attracts out with the main settlements". It is also indicated there is a need to maintain strong links "with areas out with the National Park which local authorities can provide". Such suggestions however fail to set out : - 1) The depth of impact that each single development proposal can have upon areas of high heritage value...//2) The depth of controversy that the ease of insensitive constructions within and around some existing settlements in the proposed National Park have created, particularly in Strathspey, where housing plans have much wider impacts and indeed often fail to meet local affordable housing needs...// 3) The need for consistency within the National Park in achieving the highest possible environmental qualities and standards of design, rather than resorting to the normal provisions applying to quite different districts far away from the Cairngorms. Simply introducing the status of a statutory consultee would fail to ensure that such high qualities and standards are introduced...// We therefore recommend that powers for both preparing structure and local plans and development control powers are transferred to the National Park Authority...K184</p> <p>40 years of experience of National Parks in England and Wales have seen the transfer of planning powers to all the Park Authorities. (Significantly, only the Peak District and the Lake District had this unitary power from the beginning, and arguably these two parks have been the most successful.) K0222</p> <p>The long term protection of special habitats and cultural heritage from inappropriate development requires a comprehensive and consistent approach that is currently absent. In the commission's opinion the only realistic way that this can be achieved throughout the National Park would be to transfer all the planning functions from five authorities to one authority. The National Park Authority should therefore replace the local authorities as the planning authority responsible for preparing development plans and development control decisions. K0042</p> <p>The National Park Authority should become the planning authority with the local authorities being statutory consultees. The need for a coherent, consistent and common policy is a basic tenet of a National Park. L0189</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Given the historic moment at which we now find ourselves with a new Scottish Parliament and a Government commitment to developing our first two National Parks, the MCoFS finds it saddening that this consultation document is proposing policies that would make this National Park one of the weakest in the world. The issue of planning powers is fundamental, and in our view a National Park that does not have its own planning powers is simply not going to achieve any significant level of protection for the natural heritage values. L0395</p> <p>The National Park Authority should have joint responsibility with the local authorities for the structure plan for the proposed area, to ensure the establishment of a clear overall identity. The objective must be to avoid damaging conflicts between the Park Authority and local communities as represented by the local authorities, therefore we reject 3-19, 3-20, 3-21.3-22 and the statutory consultee parts of 3-18. In Badenoch and Strathspey we have had decades of conflict over planning decisions because the role of statutory consultee is often seen as one of faultfinder in the process. To avoid future conflict we propose that the Park Authority is not a statutory consultee, but is the strategic planning authority. This will alter the nature of the relationship from one of criticism to one of assistance in achieving the wider objectives. There is sufficient legislation in existence already to ensure that local authorities implement the strategic plan when considering their individual planning functions. Similarly, if the Park Authority is the planning authority, it will be diverted by endless planning disputes and decisions from its main purpose- the achievement of the four aims.M0373</p> <p>TCPAS considers it to be vital that the proposed National Park Authority has complete authority and responsibility for the formulation and implementation of all aspects of planning including development planning and planning control. N0050</p> <p>While the Institute fully recognises the geographical realities of five council areas impinging on a sizeable mountain massif with their social, economic and cultural focus radiating in opposed directions, the special and determined measures needed to retain the effectiveness of a land use planning system within the National Park dictate that the planning powers should transfer to the NPA...// We also address the measures which would be required in the event that local authorities are to retain the powers. Whatever option is chosen, however, the Institute remains firmly of the view... that the planning authority of first resort, i.e. at the local level, should have full access to the duties, powers and liabilities of the Town and Country Planning and related Acts. Accordingly, we do not support the case for "other options" which would inevitably result in unworkable splitting of the planning function...//...In the event of local authorities retaining planning powers, we would continue to emphasise the importance of a single accountable planning authority under the terms of the Planning Acts and would therefore support the exploration of alternative methods of delivering the planning services through the statutory joint committees of the local planning authorities, delegation by the local authorities to the National Park Authority or through contracting to the National Park Authority. In these cases, the ultimate responsibility as planning authority would be retained by the local authorities and the necessary feedback loop between the policy-making of development plans and implementation through development control could be retained...// Whether or not a National Park Authority has planning powers or even has delegated or contracted responsibilities from the local authorities with regard to planning, we believe that the NPA will require to retain professional planning staff in order to respond effectively to its right of statutory consultation on planning matters. N203</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>For the NPA to have sufficient authority to implement and subsidise sustainability through agreed codes of practice, it is crucial for it to be secure in its own power and status and to be a single planning authority. In the 1990s, the Grampian and Highland Authorities had different management ethics for the Cairngorms, the one based on conservation and the other on exploitation, leading to frequent disagreements. Obviously, better agreement can be expected within a single planning authority than by involving two or several. Given that National Parks in Scotland are to be funded by the Scottish Executive, with no charge upon the constituent local authorities, there is a clear case for the local authorities to devolve their planning powers within the park area in the national interest. Local accountability is guaranteed by the majority of locally-elected members on the NPA who will ensure that the social and economic benefits of national parks are fully enjoyed by local communities. O0176</p> <p>Structure and powers of the Park - The Park Authority must also be the planning authority. A zonation policy for the park plan should be developed. O0316</p>
<p>Support for alternative options: spatial variations within Park Total: 18</p>	<p>A0180X1 K0221Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 L0056Y2 L0111Y2</p>		<p>A0121X5 A0266X5 A0398X5 J0093Y2 J0152Y1 J0201Y1 K0384Y1 L0133Y3 L0291Y1 L0302Y1 D0195Y3 N0107Y4</p>	<p>I agree in general terms with the proposed functions and powers of the Park Authority. However, I believe that the Park Authority should have an enhanced role, and therefore enhanced powers, with respect to the highly sensitive central core area, as roughly defined by Area A. Within this area the Park Authority should be directly responsible for planning amongst other things. A0180</p> <p>Planning powers should be left with the existing local authorities though there may be a case for awarding planning control over the central montane area to the new Park Authority. D0195</p> <p>BASC Scotland would not disagree with the option of planning powers, for at least the main or core area (option A), being transferred to the Park Authority. While we may not actively argue for such powers to be granted, we do have some sympathy with the argument that planning powers should be transferred to the park authority for this area alone. J0152</p> <p>Planning - This option would have definite benefit of say the NP board being the full planning authority for the core zone with the NP board being a joint structure planning authority in the cat. IV area. Given the poor protection and management of the core mountain area to date, this option is essential to ensure that the National Park interest is best served in the long term management of the park. L0291</p> <p>We strongly urge the Executive to learn from the English example where planning powers have been transferred to Park Authorities that were not granted them initially. Without powers, the Cairngorms National Park Authority will not function effectively. The Cairngorms National Park must not become a global rarity in having a National Park Authority with no planning powers - this would detract heavily from its national and international importance in the world league of nationally valuable and protected areas. K0221</p> <p>A National Park Authority that cannot sit at the planning tables as at least an equal with other planning authorities cannot be expected to do a proper job - especially under the National Parks (Scotland) Act with its socio-economic and sustainable "aims". Another planning authority could frustrate the NPAs socio-economic development intention - even if only to prove that the NPA is powerless. The NPA must be in a position to "call</p>

				in" planning applications as the ultimate development control authority for the same reason, however much initial delegation to overlapping planning authorities is sensibly required by the Ministers' designation order. N0107
Support for alternative options - LA's to remain as planning authorities but with NPA to have a right of veto over planning decisions Total: 7	A0064X1 A0253X3	A0037X4 A0220X4 A0362X4	A0232X5 A0174Y4	<p>I broadly agree that planning powers should remain with the Local Authorities and that the National Park Authority should be a statutory consultee. However, a Local Plan should be prepared for the Park Area that links in with other Structure and Local Plans and that recognises the cultural differences between the different areas. If conflict arises between bodies that operate in the National Park, then the views of the National Park Authority should prevail. However, with good representation and careful negotiation conflicts should not occur. This is, after all, one of the aims of creating the National Park Authority in the first place. A0253</p> <p>It would be sensible to retain the planning function within the local authorities but the Park Authority should be granted significant powers to review and object to any proposal which would affect the National Park in any way. A0220</p> <p>I agree in part with the proposals for the powers and functions of the National Park Authority in part but, I feel the overall decision should be left to the Park Authority. This is to allow them to make decisions if there is any major conflict between land owners, Local Authorities and other agencies such as Forest Enterprise. This is really only precautionary but I feel it should be brought in to allow intervention if necessary. A0174</p>
Support for alternative options: joint planning committees comprising LAs and NPA Total: 2			A0275X5 A0047Y3	<p>The power structure within the area needs to be a combination of all authorities. If the right of planning/power, is left with the local council, then they will ultimately use that power as they have always done. Not saying that they have done a bad job, but there are developments that lie within the proposed area that have been granted in the past, that should not have been allowed to go ahead. the area is of outstanding beauty and it can only be said that there are a few areas that are an eyesore to local communities and tourists alike. A new committee needs to be created, that involves the local council, the protected area authority and members of the local community: Local people have to be given the right to feel that A0047</p>
No confidence in the Ministers' proposal or in the Reporters' impartiality Total: 4	K0184Y2	A0020X4 A0020x4 A0198X4		<p>SNH, as reporter, is responsible for the conduct of the consultation process and for reporting its findings to the Scottish Executive. However it is also the official adviser to the Scottish Executive on all matters pertaining to the national heritage. There is a potential conflict of interest here, particularly in relation to issues on which the SNH has already adopted a committed position. In my view the most critical issue to be addressed in the proposal for a Cairngorm National Park is the question of the allocation of planning powers. SNH has already given clear indications of its preference for these to be retained by the Local Authority. This also seems to be the view of the Local Authorities. With the political dice so heavily loaded is there a realistic opportunity for a contrary view to be heard? There is a need for some kind of independent oversight of the consultation process. A0055</p> <p>We suggest that by presenting a preferred option against the transfer of planning powers, (with repeated emphasis on how it might work) the formal consultation process for the proposed Cairngorms National Park has been flawed. Respondents are led toward favouring the reporter's (SNH) own previously stated option. It therefore cannot be independent in reporting to government and as it promotes such a preference takes on the roles of judges and jury. This is particularly the case as very little provision is made within its consultation document to explain the full benefits of transferring planning powers to the National Park Authority and how</p>

				they might work. K0184
No strong view Total: 6		A0332 X4	A0318 X5 G0157Y2 K0132 Y3 L0196 Y1 L0389 Y1	<p>It appears to have been decided to leave planning function within the Park area to the local authorities. This is unusual in a UK National Park, but the Cairngorms area may be unusual itself in that most large economic initiatives requiring planning consent seem to involve a fair amount of public money. Also, most of the area simply cannot be developed due to remoteness. Neither of these situations absolves the NPA from giving due consideration to all planning applications in the light of the stated aims of the Park, and from giving an opinion to the Local Authority properly based on these aims. Certainly the planning authority should be obliged to notify Scottish Ministers if they were minded to give planning permission despite objections of the NPA. The composition of the NPA will affect the opinions that they give to the planning authority, therefore the issue of representation is vital and is dealt with in the next section. A0332</p> <p>All planning decisions must take the natural heritage of the proposed Park into account and must not be detrimental to it . It is important that any planning decision should be open to scrutiny and to appeal if the natural heritage is threatened, especially where there is conflict between opposing interests. K0132</p>

Key Issue 8i): Views on the preparation of a single local plan for the Park area				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for LA's to prepare a single Local Plan Total: 25	A0172X1 A0236X2 B0324X2 A0253X3 C0092Y2 L0260Y2 G0157Y2 A0370X1 B0001X1 B0167X1 B140X3	A0391X4 A0298X4 D0354X4	A0059X5 A0083X5 A0120Y4 A0120Y4 A0121X5 A0160X5 A0183X5 C0071Y4 K0388Y3 O0002X5 O0192Y3	<p>Single Local Plan - This seems a good idea for any key part of the area, which crosses local authority boundaries. A0059</p> <p>Since the NP is an integrated area it must be considered as a whole regarding; The local plan. A0120</p> <p>The establishment of a local plan to cover the selected area would make practical sense and perhaps avoid authorities clashing with the National Park Authority either individually or collectively. A0298</p> <p>A Local Plan must be agreed with all the councils for the park area. B0001</p> <p>A single Local Plan would be valuable in ensuring a coherent approach to planning across the National Park area and with adjoining areas. B0324</p> <p>I think it is necessary that there be a single integrated and comprehensive plan for the whole area of the Park, recognising that this will have to be therefore more of a "framework" rather than "detailed" plan. C0071</p> <p>... staff regarded the development of a single Local Plan (or a management plan) covering the whole National Park (to which the National Parks Authority would presumably have the main input) as an imperative. K0388</p> <p>However, a Local Plan for the Park should be prepared. Local authorities should consult the Park on all development proposals and all those where no agreement can be reached should be notified to the Scottish Executive. O0192</p>
Support for present Local Plan arrangements to remain Total: 21	A0272X3 A0342X3 F0381X3 B0146Y2 E0104Y2 B0223X2 B0348X1 B0396X3 E0123Y2 E0123Y2 E0126Y2 H0171Y2		A0275X5 A0297X5 J0352Y1 M0204Y1 C0397Y3 C0397Y3 E0145Y3	<p>There should not be a separate local plan for the National Park. The preparation of structure and local plans rests with the local authorities. Settlements such as Ballater and Braemar would expect to be in the Aberdeenshire local plan as that is the area with which they have an affinity, just as Pitlochry would feel more at home with Perthshire and Aviemore with Highland Council. A0272</p> <p>There can be no single plan for the whole area as discussed above. The control of the local authorities on how the local communities develop their villages will require a totally different set of priorities to how to manage a wild montane environment. How can planning a footpath alongside Loch Morlich compare with building a footpath across the plateau? And what is the point of a locally elected NPA if the local authorities do not have to consult with them or if they are able to give planning permission against their wishes. A0275</p> <p>There is no need for a single local plan; Braemar is not local to Aviemore but all communities need a process</p>

	F0230X2 J0224Y2 J0241Y2 K0105Y2			<p>of building enforceable planning and design guidelines within and for the local areas. The Park should play a support role in this process bringing in specialist advisors with practical experience of achieving good design and assisting practitioners and community leaders to understand and visit what is being done elsewhere. Local Authorities and the Park should be required to consult each other on their respective plans on all points. B0348</p> <p>The Cairngorms at present lacks a strong land management plan, the preparation of which will be an early priority for the Park Authority. Conversely, the local authorities all have local plans already in place, some of which are completely up to date. These local plans address a wide range of issues affecting the Cairngorms communities, including their vital relationships with the major service and employment centres upon which they rely. To expect the Park Authority to redo this work not only seems a pointless exercise, but would divert attention and energy from the production of a management plan. C0397</p> <p>The main focus within the Park should be on the National Park Plan providing a strategic guide to structure and Local Plans. The National Park Plan would concentrate on land management and recreational issues leaving the local planning authorities to deal with land use development. E0123</p> <p>A single plan for the Park would be inappropriate for a variety of reasons such as local sensitive issues that emanate in different areas of the Park is very large under any of the options. The Park Board as a statutory consultee is in a good position with plenty of precedent with SEPA and EH as examples of consultee who work in an excellent way with planning authorities. F0381</p> <p>The current position throughout the area in Development Plans, i.e. Structure Plans and Local Plans, should be retained with the National Park Authority being a statutory consultee. All five local authorities should be obliged to consult in the preparation of the parts of Development Plans, which relate to the National Park area. M0204</p>
Support for NPA and LA's to jointly prepare a Structure plan Total: 1	A0322X3			Initially at least I favour leaving planning control with the Local Authorities. However the Park should, in consultation with Local Authorities, prepare the structural policy/plan for its area. All the other powers enumerated in table 2 should go the Park. A0322
Support for NPA to prepare local plan Total: 40	A0017X5 A0049X3 J0093Y2 K0184Y2 A0072X1 A0078X1 A0082X1 A0110X1 A0210X2 A0259X1	A0004X4 A0044X4 A0091X4 A0139X4 A0198X4 5	A0010X5 O0068X5 A0087X5 A0164X5 K0299X5 A0387X5 J0152Y1 J0201Y1 K0060Y1 K0127Y1	I feel that it is important to achieve a coherent approach to planning matters throughout the National Park, and, in particular, that a single Local Plan is prepared to cover the whole area of the national park, and it would appear that this is more likely to be achievable if the National Park Authority holds such powers, than if they are parcelled out to some half-dozen discrete Local Authorities. I should also note that to give planning powers to the new Park Authority is in keeping with the overwhelming majority view as expressed in responses to the earlier Scottish Executive consultation on The National Parks (Scotland) Bill. It would seem essential, when deciding this matter, to take note of what models are in operation in National Parks in the rest of the UK, if not world-wide, and what has been most successful elsewhere. Whichever model is decided on, co-option of members of all relevant statutory authorities is preferable to relegating either party to the vague role of 'consultee'. A0010

<p>A0319X1 A0329X1 A0382X1 B0062X2 K0221Y2 K0221Y2 K0269Y2 L0012Y2</p>		<p>K0165Y1 K0384Y1 K0149Y1 K0239Y1 L0372Y1 N0203Y1 N0300Y1</p>	<p>(The NPA) should prepare a single development plan in consultation with the Local Authorities and others which would replace existing Local Plans. It should deal with both strategic and local issues and be approved by the Scottish Executive. As indicated above it would be highly desirable to have one plan for the whole Park Area but, in view of the national and international importance of the Cairngorms, this should have more significance than a Local Plan. A0045</p> <p>A single Local Plan, or a single strategic plan and a number of Local Plans would be a practical option. This should be prepared jointly by the NPA and the local authorities concerned. A0087</p> <p>I strongly feel that there should be a single Local Plan for the whole of the Park area. Ideally this would be prepared by the NPA subject, of course, to consultation with the Local Authorities whose views should, of course, be considered. A0139</p> <p>The NPA should be responsible for the preparation and delivery of Local Plans (I.e. the National Park Plan) with Local Authorities as statutory consultees. As is often the case in England and Wales, the preparation of the structure plan should be the responsibility of the NPA with Local Authorities as partners and consultees. J0093</p> <p>The National Park should be covered by just one local plan. We can see no justification for more than one, although various areas of character within the park could be identified within that one plan. K0060</p> <p>There should be a single Local Plan for the area of the National Park for the same reason that the NPA should be the planning authority. The planning function has a different emphasis from the general run of the local authorities. The Park should be seen as an entity for purposes of integrated management and every power exercised should accord with the provisions of the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. K0149</p> <p>There seems to be little benefit in establishing a National Park unless it is to be managed in accordance with a single Park Plan, developed up by the Park Authority in consultation with all interested parties. L0226</p> <p>The Institute supports the preparation of a single Local Plan (or unitary development plan) for the whole of the National Park area. We see no advantage in establishing a co-operative basis for preparing a single Local Plan for only part of the area. It is essential that the National Park is managed, as far as possible, as a single unit for all purposes. N0203</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Support for NPA to prepare several local plans Total: 7</p>	<p>B0138X3 B0337X1</p>		<p>A0369X5 K0147Y3 K0154Y1 L0042Y3 L0156Y4</p>	<p>There could be separate Local Plans for separate areas of the Park if the Park was very large. A0369</p> <p>A single Local Plan is not appropriate - The Cairngorms area is based around a mountain massif across which communication is difficult. As a result the communities surrounding the massif are distinctive and may have little in common with communities on the other side of the area. It would be better if distinctive communities each had their own distinctive plan. These plans could be co-ordinated through a common strategy or broad guidelines provided by the National Park. B0337</p> <p>It follows from my views on key issue 7 that I think that the Local Plan should be prepared by the National Park Authority, it may be convenient to sub-divide the area according to geographic criteria and provide a Local Plan for each sub-area, but it is most important to adopt a consistent approach. L0156</p>
<p>Comments relating to the role and function of the National Park Plan Total: 5</p>	<p>J0261Y2 K0112Y2 L0111Y2</p>		<p>C0306 Y1 O0289X5</p>	<p>The proposal for the National Park Plan in relation to planning issues, is unclear in concept. It is vitally important to recognise that planning issues affecting the Spey and its tributaries within the Cairngorms area not only have consequences within the Cairngorms area but affect the whole of the Spey river system. There is no clarification as to whether the Park Plan is legally binding or whether it will take precedence over existing planning control and other groupings such as the Spey Catchment Steering Group. J0261</p> <p>As far as I can see, to ensure that "co-ordination" (criteria 4) would require a single management plan. Then by relying on zones it may be possible to deal with more detail with certain areas and also identify those which require special protection. This will also allow that for those areas which are towns or settlements the planning authority can develop its own plan. If the local authorities are to retain their planning powers they should develop the plan for their corresponding town/settlement, O0289</p>

Key Issue 8ii): Views on consultation arrangements				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for LA's as the planning authorities to consult NPA on all development proposals Total: 53	A0049X3 A0219X2 A0236X2 A0253X3 A0342X3 A0355X1 B0001X1 B0138X3 B0324X2 C0142X3 D0327Y2 G0157Y2 J0224Y2 J0241Y2 J0261Y2 K0105Y2 K0269Y2 J0356Y2 L0036Y3 L0226Y2 L0260Y2 K0221Y2 L0321Y2 23	A0020X4 A0198X4 A0220X4 A0298X4 4	A0034Z A0045Y3 A0120Y4 A0063X5 A0087X5 A0121X5 A0160X5 A0164X5 A0183X5 A0347X5 B0077Y3 C0306Y1 J0352Y1 K0060Y1 K0144Y3 K0147Y3 K0154Y1 K0299X5 M0204Y1 N0300Y1 N0349Y1 O0002X5 O0007Y3 O0051Y3 O0068X5 O0192Y3 26	<p>If the Scottish Executive's proposal is approved and the planning authorities have to consult the NPA on all applications in the Park area, then it would be as well for the NPA to be the planning authority, as previously argued. If the NPA was the planning authority and had to consult with the appropriate Council, those Councils have planning departments already, so can retain a few staff to deal with park consultation. Vice versa, and the NPA will require to establish a full planning department, despite not being the planning authority. Whatever the end result, the NPA must have input to planning applications in its area, if it is to truly be the custodian of the natural and cultural heritage of the area and be the overseer for the sustainable social and economic development of the Park area. A0087</p> <p>We agree with the powers proposed for the NPA and specifically endorse leaving responsibility for the planning function with the local authorities. This seems to us eminently practical and will meet our concern that people living in the Park area should be able to secure affordable housing. The NPA should, of course, be a statutory consultee during development planning and in decision making in appropriate cases. A0219</p> <p>The powers given to the National Park Authority (NPA) should be the minimum necessary to fulfil its role. It should not have unnecessary powers, e.g. planning authority. It could become a mandatory consultee in the planning process with the right of appeal to ministers, if necessary. B0077</p> <p>It would be logical, if the proposed Park Authority is to be a statutory consultee, that it should be consulted on all proposals within the proposed Park area and within a given distance of its boundary. The proposed Park Authority would be better able to form a judgement on whether or not any given proposal would have an impact on the special qualities of the area. C0142</p> <p>Planning should remain under the control of Local Authorities, but that the Park Authority should have a statutory consultative role which allows for any application on which agreement cannot be reached to be called in to the Executive for determination (in effect, a veto). Practically, the Council takes the view that there is very little difference between this approach and its exact opposite - provided the other party has the statutory function, but the infrastructure and immediately local understanding is already in place within local authorities and its re-creation within a new authority would take time and is likely to present difficulties. D0327</p> <p>If it is decided, despite the overwhelming case against it, to let the planning function reside with the local authorities, then the Park Authority must be consulted on all development proposals. In practice it may be impossible to agree on what constitutes a development "of particular importance to the special qualities of the National Park". K0299</p> <p>It is desirable to confirm that if the Scottish Ministers preferred option is accepted, any objections by the NPA will automatically result in proposals being called in, as indicated in the consultation document paragraph 3.20. Whatever is decided, it is imperative that a single plan is drawn up for the National Park, and not a</p>

				<p>series of component parts drawn up by LAs working in isolation. N0349</p> <p>The second question posed under key issue 8 strongly suggests that a decision has already been made regarding planning powers being held by the local authorities. All development proposals within a National Park are relevant to the National Park Authority who should always be party to the decision making process even if this only amounts to immediately delegating the responsibility to the relevant Local Authority. Referral to Scottish Ministers should be at the discretion of the National Park Authority. K0269</p>
<p>Support for LA's as the planning authority to consult NPA on certain categories of proposal Total: 27</p>	<p>A0078X1 A0272X3 B0396X3 A0370X1 B0337X1 B0223X2 F0230X2 C0353Y2 C0397Y3 E0104Y2 E0123Y2 E0123Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 E0399Y2 B0146Y2 C0092Y2 17</p>	<p>A0037X4 A0079X4 2</p>	<p>A0059X5 A0090X5 A0297X5 A0083X5 K0158Y1 K0165Y1 N0050Y1 O0289X5 8</p>	<p>I agree that the Park Authority should be consulted on planning applications in the same way that Historic Scotland is involved with listed building applications, but the residents of the area should through their elective representatives, have the last word in any decisions affecting their livelihoods and way of life. In addition, steps must be taken to ensure that any such consultation minimises any delay in processing applications. A0090</p> <p>It should be sufficient that local planning officers only refer to the Park Authority applications where the park authority has an obvious interest. Another approach would be for the park authority to be consulted on every application that is for development outwith existing settlement boundaries or where an application involves the enlargement of these boundaries. B0146</p> <p>We suggest that local authorities should only be required to consult the National Park Authority on issues of importance to the special qualities of the park. B0396</p> <p>My view on key issue 8 is that there is little to be gained from establishing a single local plan for all or part of the area, that local authorities should be obliged to consult the Park Authority on all development proposals, except where no change of use is proposed; and that local authorities should be required to notify Scottish Ministers only where they are of particular importance to the special qualities of the National Park as determined by the Park Authority. It is essential that local authorities should consult the Park Authority on all material planning applications. C0397</p> <p>The Council do however recognise the need for the five local authorities to apply consistent policies across the National Park area and would welcome close working arrangements with the NPA. To strengthen this approach the five local authorities propose to work to the following arrangements. - The NPA should be a statutory consultee in the preparation of Structure and Local Plans by local authorities wholly or partly covering its area. -In preparing Structure and Local Plans, a local authority must consult the other. E0123</p> <p>The local authority only needs to notify the Park Authority that an application has been received. This is something they do every week for Community Councils and other statutory consultees. The Park Authority has the choice to respond or not respond as it sees fit. A0079</p> <p>I would say that it would NOT be necessary to consult the National Park Authority in all aspects. A very close working relationship is what is needed, where the people involved TRUST one another, and have the</p>

				knowledge that decisions are taken for the benefit of the local population and not for political reasons. A0083
Support for NPA as the planning authority to consult LAs on all aspects of planning Total: 4	B0062X2		K0127Y1 L0302Y1 O0294Y3	The local authority should be consulted on all development matters. B0062 The problem is defining which development proposals would have an impact on the "special qualities". This is bound to lead to conflict and the NPA should assume planning control. O0294
Support for the NPA as the planning authority to consult LAs on certain cases Total: 4	A0078X1		K0158Y1 K0165Y1 N0050Y1	A single structure plan, local plan, and a set of development control policies and design guides appropriate to the NP must be the way forward, of course with the NPA consulting the LAs. In the case of development control only applications of significance should be the subject of consultation with the relevant LA. K0158 TCPAS considers it to be vital that the proposed National Park Authority has complete authority and responsibility for the formulation and implementation of all aspects of planning including development planning and planning control. Local Authorities should be consulted by the Park Authority on all aspects of planning matters which may be of significance to them. N0050
Support for use of weekly list or development control schemes Total 3		A0079X4	N0203Y1 O0289X5	We believe that, whether the local authorities or the NPA are the planning authorities, there should be a statutory requirement for each to consult the other on all development proposals (development plans, planning applications and other statutory measures) but that a development control scheme should be agreed with each individual authority, preferably consistent across all the authorities, under which the designated planning authority would waive its rights to consultation in specified categories. (RTPI - see letter) N0203
Comments on cross boundary implications of proposed developments Total: 12	A0210X2 L0254Y2	A0004X4	A0016Z A0044Y3 A0052Y3 C0306Y1 K0149Y1 K0158Y1 K0385Y3 L0302Y1 O0007Y3	The Park Authority, as the prime decision-maker and arbiter of quality must have full knowledge of all planning applications within the National Park and be consulted on all planning applications which would affect the environs immediately external to the Park boundary. K0149 The designation order should also lay an obligation on local authorities adjacent to the Park to consult with the Park Authority over their planning policies and key development control decisions. L0302

Key Issue 8ii): Views on Ministerial notification arrangements

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for Ministerial notification arrangements to apply to all development proposals where there is conflict Total: 49	A0236X2 B0001X1 B0062X2 B0337X1 C0142X3 C0353Y2 D0327Y2 E0104Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 F0381X3 K0105Y2 G0157Y2 K0221Y2 L0226Y2 L0226Y2 M0204Y2	A0004X4 A0020X4 A0220X4 A0044X4 A0198X4 A0211 X4 A0332X4	A0045Y3 A0052Y3 A0059X5 A0087X5 A0121X5 A0183X5 A0297X5 A0369X5 C0071Y4 A0016Z K0060Y1 K0149Y1 K0385Y3 L0036Y3 L0302Y1 N0300Y1 N0349Y1 O0007Y3 O0002X5 O0051Y3 A0120Y4 O0068X5 O0192Y3 O0289X5	<p>As with the present system regarding designated areas of national or international importance, the National Park Authority should be a statutory consultee as suggested in the consultation paper, paras 3.18 and 3.19. It should be able to object to any advertised planning applications, and if the planning authority, despite such objection, was minded to approve an application which was contrary to the basic policies in the National Park Plan, the planning authority should be obliged to refer the matter to the Scottish Ministers. Where the NPA recommends refusal of an application which the planning authority is minded to approve, the application should be notified to Scottish Ministers under call-in procedures. F0230</p> <p>If in the event, the local authorities do retain planning powers, in my view they should have to consult the Park Authority on all development proposals, and they should have to notify Scottish Ministers on all such proposals which they are minded to approve against the wishes for the Park Authority. O0068</p> <p>We find it inconceivable to think of circumstances where an external body can make a decision on any planning issue against the wishes of the Park Authority and then compound that by not referring it to the Minister for decision. K0149</p> <p>Where the National Park Authority recommends refusal of a planning application which the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve, or the Local Planning Authority does not intend to attach a condition recommended by the National Park Authority, the application should be notified to Scottish Ministers with a possible call in power. There should be a duty on all Local Planning Authorities and the National Park Authority to meet regularly to co-ordinate policies and discuss matters of mutual concern. E0104</p> <p>Where the national park authority recommends refusal of a planning application, which the planning authority is minded to approve, the application should be referred to the Scottish Minister. The local authorities and the National Park Authority should hold an annual monitoring and evaluation meeting, to ensure the co-ordination of policies and decisions, including within emerging development plans, and to discuss matters of mutual concern regarding overall policy towards effective planning in the Cairngorms. E0126</p>

<p>Support for Ministerial notification arrangements to apply to certain categories of proposal Total: 9</p>	<p>A0148X3 A0272X3 C0092Y2 C0092Y2</p>		<p>A0063X5 A0083X5 J0352Y1 C0397Y3 C0397Y3</p>	<p>... much will depend on the volume of development proposals received and as to how rigorous significance tests can be made. A0063</p> <p>Any requirement to notify the Scottish Ministers of a proposed grant of planning permission against the wishes of the Park Authority should only relate to those which are of particular importance to the special qualities of the National Park. C0092</p> <p>The same principle of avoiding unnecessary delay and bureaucracy applies to the need to involve Scottish Ministers in the case of dispute. When responding to a planning consultation, the Park Authority could indicate whether the proposal was, in its view, of particular importance to the special qualities of the National Park. Only these instances would it be necessary for the Planning Authority to notify Scottish Ministers that it wished to reject the advice of the Park Authority, C0397</p>
<p>Support for a general right of appeal to to Scottish Ministers on any application determined by local authorities Total: 9</p>	<p>K0269Y2</p>	<p>A0079X4</p>	<p>A0010X5 B0077Y3 C0306Y1 K0147Y3 N0203Y1 K0154Y1 N0304Y1</p>	<p>An appeal to Ministers is essential where any differences of opinion may emerge. C0306</p> <p>The National Park Authority should be a statutory consultee and have the ability to call issues in to the minister. SWT is not convinced that the Scottish Executive term "to have regard for" is a sufficiently robust instruction to other public agencies to integrate their activities with those of the park authority and would wish to see this instruction strengthened. K0154</p> <p>The powers given to the National Park Authority (NPA) should be the minimum necessary to fulfil its role. It should not have unnecessary powers, e.g. planning authority. It could become a mandatory consultee in the planning process with the right of appeal to ministers, if necessary. B0077</p> <p>As far as possible, the National Park Authority and Local Authority should have equal rights and duties in all aspects of planning permission, and both sides should have the right to take any disputed matter to higher authorities, whether national (for instance the Scottish Executive) or international, in any instance where local resolution cannot be obtained. A0010</p>

Key Issue 9i: Views on the size of the governing Board of the Park Authority

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for 25 members Total: 111	A0064X1 A0067X1 A0078X1 A0110X1 A0163X3 A0219X2 A0236X2 A0271X2 A0272X3 A0312Y2 A0315X1 A0319X1 A0322X3 A0329X1 A0342X3 A0355X1 A0370X1 B0001X1 B0138X3 B0146Y2 B0167X1 B0324X2 B0324X2 C0142X3 C0353Y2 D0191Y2 D0202Y2 E0104Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 F0381X3 H0343Y2 H0343Y2 J0093Y2 J0241Y2 J0330Y2	A0079X4 A0108X4 A0139X4 A0198X4 A0200X4 A0211X4 A0220X4 A0234X4 A0240X4 A0247X4 A0277X4 A0298X4 A0363X4 A0364X4	A0059X5 A0063X5 A0083X5 A0087X5 A0090X5 A0121X5 A0164X5 A0183X5 A0243Y4 A0250X5 A0262Y4 A0263X5 A0281X5 A0339Y4 A0347X5 A0374X5 A0375X5 A0379X5 A0380Y4 A0387X5 A0398X5 A0401Y4 C0306Y1 J0352Y1 K0132Y3 K0147Y3 K0149Y1 K0154Y1 K0165Y1 K0366Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 L0036Y3 L0291Y1 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 L0326Y1	<p>I agree with the proposal for membership - there is a balance of potential viewpoints, which should hopefully represent the views of locals and visitors alike. A0355X1</p> <p>Despite concerns that a Board of 25 will be unwieldy as a decision making body, we are concerned that, if the larger area options are adopted, it will not be possible to achieve sufficiently comprehensive local representation within the 20% allocation to elected members, and the 40% of Local Authority nominations. B0324X2</p> <p>The size of the proposed Board is reasonable. A Board of 25 members would allow for a spread of interests and ensure that the proposed board could not be taken over by a small clique. C0142X3</p> <p>I agree with the proposed number (25) that the Authority should have, but not on its composition. Membership must be based on equal representation by as many organisations that have a vested interest in the Cairngorms. A0240X4</p> <p>I support the maximum sizes proposed provided that the members have relevant knowledge and expertise appropriate to the task. A0347X5</p> <p>To ensure maximum representation of the interests and expertise associated with the delivery of national park aims, sportscotland agrees with the Scottish Ministers' recommendation that a maximum of twenty five members should sit on a Cairngorms National Park Authority (NPA). L0301Y1</p> <p>WWF agrees that a total number of Board members of 25, 5 of whom are elected, is appropriate. K0112Y2</p> <p>LINK members generally agree that 25 members is appropriate, and, therefore, that 5 members is the appropriate number of directly elected members. K0255Y2</p> <p>For a Park of the size contemplated the NPA will clearly need to be of the maximum size allowed by statute. N0107Y4</p>

	K0112Y2 K0184Y2 K0221Y2 K0222Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 K0341Y2 L0012Y2 L0111Y2 L0226Y2 L0254Y2 L0260Y2 M0204Y2 M0373Y2		L0372Y1 L0395Y1 N0050Y1 N0107Y4 N0203Y1 N0304Y1 N0349Z O0007Y3 O0294Y3	
Support for less than 25 members Total: 24	A0072X1 A0103X1 A0148X3 A0394X1 A0394X1 A0399X3 B0140X3 B0223X2 B0348X1 J0224Y2 J0102Y2 L0041Y2	A0044X4 A0065X4 D0354X4	A0010X5 A0016Z A0045Y3 A0159X5 A0249Y4 C0081X5 J0313Y1 K0127Y1 O0289X5	<p>An NPA of 25 members is too large to be an effective working group. Suggest 15 would be better and still allow sufficient representation within the Option A area. A0072X1</p> <p>A Board of Fifteen. Five nominated by the First Minister. Five local councillors and Five nominated by the local community associations. B0223X2</p> <p>In my view 25 members, which is the maximum number, seems an excessive number for a Park Board to reach consensus and act effectively, and maybe between 15-20 members would be more suitable. O0289X5</p> <p>In the view of the Association this is too large to enable the members to become closely involved and to develop the sense of collegiate responsibility and purpose that could be achieved with a smaller grouping. It is understood that the intention to settle on the larger figure is because of the wide range of local authorities involved and the Association strongly recommends that if it is decided to proceed with a smaller area, thus excluding one or more local authorities, then the opportunity should be taken to reduce the overall numbers in each category of appointee. L0041Y2</p>
Support for more than 25 Total: 2	A0180X1		A0297X5	The proposed size of the Park Authority Board at 25 is probably too small to allow effective representation for an area the size of Area C. A0180X1
Other comments Total: 4	G0157Y2		A0017X5 A0043Y3 C0051Y3	Our only comment would be that priority should be given to preserving the Board's effectiveness and cohesion. G0157Y2

Key Issue 9ii: Views on the Number of Directly elected members				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for Ministers' proposal: 5 directly elected members; 10 LA nominated members; and 10 members directly appointed by Scottish Ministers Total: 61	A0055X1 A0064X1 A0067X1 A0072X1 A0110X1 A0219X2 A0267X2 A0272X3 A0312X2 A0322X3 A0355X1 B0062X2 D0169Y2 D0202Y2 E0104Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 F0381X3 G0157Y2 J0093Y2 J0102Y2 J0330Y2 K0221Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 L0012Y2 L0226Y2 L0254Y2 L0260Y2 M0204Y2	A0053X4 A0139X4 A0186X4 A0198X4 A0200X4 A0220X4 A0265X4 A0277X4 A0363X4	A0016Z A0047Y3 A0063X5 A0137Y4 A0250X5 A0401Y4 C0051Y3 K0132Y3 K0154Y1 K0355Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 K0388Y3 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 L0372Y1 L0395Y1 N0349Z O0007Y3 O0289X5 O0294Y3	<p>Whatever system is adopted the legislative framework ensures that local people will be well represented on the Board either by directly elected members or by members nominated by Local Authorities or Scottish Ministers. It is more than likely that local people will be in the majority. I support the breakdown in paragraph 3.27 which also ensures that the national interest is adequately represented. A0055X1</p> <p>I agree with the proposal for membership - there is a balance of potential viewpoints which should hopefully represent the views of locals and visitors alike. A0355X1</p> <p>The size of the Park Board should be the maximum 25, with 20% being directly elected by people on the electoral rolls for the Park area, divided into wards, which reflect the current local authority divisions, subject to parity. F0230X2</p> <p>The suggested arrangements for NPA members seem workable and reasonably capable of dovetailing the interests involved. 5 locals, 10 from the local authorities and 10 from central government seems a fair balance. A0401Y4</p> <p>The SWT considers the total numbers on the board should remain at 25 and that 5 should be directly elected from those living in the Park. It should be recognised that potentially some of these 5 could also be councillors. K0154Y1</p> <p>You will also note from the Minute that the Council is not unanimous on the composition of the National Park Authority Board and went on to vote to clarify its position. However the eventual position of the Council was that the proposals for five directly elected nominees together with ten drawn through nominations from local authorities approved by Ministers, together with ten direct ministerial appointees, was the Council's final position. E0399Y2</p> <p>A solid local commitment to designation is important for the success of the proposal and it is felt that without the levels of representation mentioned in the consultation document, it may be rather difficult to sustain the necessary level of commitment over the long term. G0157Y2</p> <p>LINK members generally agree that 25 members is appropriate, and, therefore, that 5 members is the appropriate number of directly elected members. K0255Y2</p>

Support for equal or broadly equal share of directly elected members to local authority nominations and Ministerial appointments Total: 20	A0076X1 A0271X2 A0342X3 A0394X1 B0143X3 B0223X2 B0348X1 J0224Y2	A0004X4 A0240X4 A0328X4	A0087X5 A0164X5 A0232X5 A0297X5 C0306Y1 J0313Y1 J403Y1 K0127Y1 L0189Y3	<p>To set a minimum of just 20% of Park Board members being directly elected seems low to me. A better balance would be to have 24 members, with equal proportions (ie 1/3rd, 8 each) being elected, appointed on nomination of local authorities, and directly appointed by Scottish Ministers. A0076X1</p> <p>Eight members directly elected by those living in the electoral wards covering the park area (the 8 preferably residing within the Park), 7 or 8 members appointed on nomination of local authorities and 9 or 10 members directly appointed. A0271X2</p> <p>We would prefer to see an increased proportion of local directly elected members to at least one third of the total to encourage a greater sense of local ownership of the Park Service. Such an allocation would also prevent any imbalance or political bias developing on the Board. B0143X3</p> <p>The key to the effective development of this purpose will be a significant majority of local people on the Board ie this should be at least one third of the Board, should probably be half and, in any case, should be larger by one than any other group of organisations on the Board e.g. Government including Las., or NGOs etc. A0328X4</p> <p>I suggest that 15 people would be a maximum for effective decision making and reasonable use of public money, to be made up of 5 each of directly elected, local authority nominated and directly appointed members. A0164X5</p> <p>We propose that the 15 should be appointed on the basis of a 5:5:5 ratio of directly elected members, local authority nominated members and those appointed by Scottish Ministers. K0127Y1</p>
Support for 50% or more directly elected members (13:6:6 etc) Total: 9	A0097X1 A0049X3 B0396X3 C0309Y2 D0327Y2	A0037X4 A0065X4 A0284X4	A0305X5	<p>The Board must not become yet another quango. Accordingly one must view with dismay and disappointment the suggestion that only 20% of the members be directly elected: that is an insult to the principles of local democracy and should be rejected in favour of a Board comprising 24 members of whom at least 50% must be directly elected. A0049X3</p> <p>I would be concerned that we should have a higher proportion of elected NPA members than appointed by Ministers as you propose. We need control locally. A0284X4</p> <p>The Council believes that the proportion of Park Authority Members directly elected locally should be higher than the minimum specified in the enabling legislation - the consensus of public opinion in the council's area is strongly for 50% of the Authority to be locally directly elected. The Council recognises that this may leave too little room for the appointment of sufficient Nationally recognised expertise in what is, after all, a National asset, but nevertheless takes the view that as close to fifty percent locally elected representation as practically possible should be achieved. D0327Y2</p>
General support for more directly elected members	A0026X3 A0082X1 A0141X1 A0148X3 A0163X3	A0053X4 A0211X4 A0340X4 A0367X4 D0354X4	A0025X5 A0058X5 A0398X5 B0077Y3 K0170Y1	<p>Election of one individual from each main communities within the Park would yield 7 individuals. Allowing the appointment of 3 Local Authority representatives from the two key authorities - Highland and Aberdeenshire - plus 2 each from Moray, Angus and Perth & Kinross yields a further 12. If those appointed by Minister are held at 10 this gives a minimum of 29. A0180X1</p>

<p>Total: 36</p>	<p>A0180X1 A0278X1 A0315X1 A0319X1 A0370X1 B0078X2 B0140X3 B0146Y2 B0287Y2 B0324X2 C0105Y2 C0142X3 C0288Y2 C0353Y2 D0096Y2 D0129X2 J0307Y2 J0331Y2 M0373Y2</p>		<p>L0133Y3 L0389Y1</p>	<p>The proportions are totally wrong: the locally elected element should be 40%, the Local Authority nominated element should be 40% and the Scottish Ministers appointed. A0211X4</p> <p>The low number of NPA members directly elected by local people - five - should be increased to seven and the number appointed by the LAs should be nine, and the number appointed by Scottish Ministers also nine. Although some or almost all of those appointed by LAs will be local people, and even some of those appointed by Ministers, this suggested ratio might give local people a sense of having a greater stake, and may prove valuable in the event of conflicts. K0170Y1</p> <p>There is considerable distrust of conservation and environmental pressure groups in at least part of the core area. Only when the final composition of the Board is known, will there be the possibility of confidence in the Board's ability to deliver. This being the case, there is perhaps a strong case for the Cairngorms National Park having more than the minimum number of directly elected representatives. Also, if the size of the park is restricted to the core area, with only three local councils involved, it should be possible to have less local authority representatives involved. B0146Y2</p> <p>We suggest that one elected member should ideally represent an average of 2,000 residents. This would mean that, the larger the Park area, the greater the number of elected members, each representing a ward. M0373Y2</p>
<p>General support for more local representation Total: 10</p>	<p>A0019X2 A0314X3 B0167X1 B0337X1 J0241Y2 K0341Y2 L0321Y2</p>		<p>L0175X5 N0304Y1 D0118Y3</p>	<p>A majority of the Park Board (greater than 50%) must live or work within the Park or be representative, experienced and knowledgeable of the interests of the communities and economic activities within the Park. B0337X1</p> <p>The management of the finalised Park does also give us some concern in that 20 of the 25 members will be appointed by Scottish Ministers. D0118Y3</p>
<p>General support for more national representation Total: 34</p>	<p>A0103X1 A0111Y2 A0210X2 A0225X1 A0329X1 A0371X1 B0337X1 K0255Y2 K0341Y2</p>	<p>A0200X4 A0234X4 A0277X4 A0283X4 A0295X4</p>	<p>A0121X5 A0128X5 A0232X5 A0262X5 A0266X5 A0275X5 A0281X5 A0293X5 A0296X5 A0310Y4 A0339Y4 A0374X5 A0375X5 A0379X5 A0387X5 C0071Y4</p>	<p>The proposed National Parks Authority provides for some representation for the communities within the area but none for users. SNH Recreation Surveys of 1997-8 and 1998-9 show that nearly half the people using recreational facilities in the Cairngorms have been doing so for more than 10 years. Many of these people are like me committed to the area. I have been a regular visitor to Speyside for more than 24 years with a base in the valley for the past 15. A0225X1</p> <p>However many local members are on the Park Board it should be remembered that this is a National not a local Park. There should be no requirement that appointees are local. Expertise and knowledge of the Cairngorms and a belief in the need to restore and conserve the environment are more important than where someone lives. A0210X2</p> <p>I also feel that the Park should be more nationally represented than that being proposed in the choosing of members for the Park Authority. Too much emphasis seems to be given to local authority submissions. As the boundaries of the Park are still to be decided, and since the choice of either area, or the population, has yet to be made to empower these authorities, the political jockeying for advantage may well obstruct effective voting. A0232X5</p>

			K0384Y1 L0161Y3 L0196Y1 L0326Y1	<p>Whilst the support of local people is vital in the success of the Park, it is a national, and indeed international, resource and it is vital that the broader national interest is also well represented on the Board. A0266X5</p> <p>Given the national and international importance of the Cairngorms, it is important that there is a strong national representation on the Board. The whole purpose of national parks is to safeguard the nation's outstanding landscapes, wildlife quality and recreational value so we would like to see a substantial presence of people reflecting these aspects of expertise. K0384Y1</p> <p>Within these constraints we believe that the Cairngorms Park Authority should include the maximum number of members with a national perspective. Again we agree with the Cairngorms Campaign, who state that as Parks are being funded nationally from the public purse there should be a strong national representation on the Board. We are also strongly of the opinion that this national representation should cover both conservation and recreational interests, particularly as it is likely that local representation is likely to favour economic and social interests. L0161Y3</p>
Support for community council representation Total: 4	A0319X1 A0236X2	A0295X4	A0160X5	It should include many representatives from the local area. It does not need any directly elected members, since the LA and Community Councils should already provide appropriate members. This is an unnecessary bureaucratic procedure that does not directly serve democracy, since very few people will vote in the elections. Much better to use Community Councils and normal local authority elections to provide members. A0236X2
Support for other frameworks Total: 6	J0216Y2 K0197Y2		A0090X5 A0245X5 A0249Y4 A0045Y3	<p>I do not agree with the current proposals, and suggest that the make-up of the 25 members should be: a) Elected directly by residents - 5, b) Appointed by local business interests - 4, c) Appointed by relevant recreational/sport bodies - 3, d) Appointed by Local Authorities - 7, e) Appointed by Scottish Ministers - 6. A0090X5</p> <p>Our group could be represented by a directly elected member of the farming community. // Farming members could be rotated each term from the 5 council areas. J0216Y2</p>
Comments on the links to the election order Total: 6	A0178X1 D0327Y2 E0399Y2 M0373Y2	A0079X4	O0002X5	<p>Even if the area were to be confined to all of option A, how much of a voice would the people of Braemar and Crathie have against those of Newtonmore, Kingussie, Kincaig, Aviemore, Carrbridge and Boat of Garten? With unrestricted direct elections, the area of option A has the Speyside population to ensure a clean sweep for interests on that side of the Cairngorms. Having observed previous development of Aviemore, one is not encouraged by the prospect. A0178X1</p> <p>We have tried to think of the optimum number of residents that each elected member should represent to enable a relationship that would make sense to people in diverse and sparsely populated rural communities. It is critical that warding makes sense to the people living within the ward, and that there are direct and effective links between the elected member and a geographical community. We consider it essential that we have a common sense solution to warding if direct elections are to do what they are supposed to do, i.e. bring forward an approachable representative for all communities within the designated area. M0373Y2</p>
Comments on	A0267X2	A0247X4	A0244Y4	Every member, including the chairman should serve for a fixed term, say five years and not be eligible for re-

<p>the need for openness and accountability of Board members Total: 16</p>	<p>A0390X3 D0327Y2 K0222Y2 K0255Y2</p>	<p>A0283X4</p>	<p>A0245X5 A0250X5 A0262Y4 A0270X5 A0281Y4 A0350Y4 A0392Y4 K0384Y1</p>	<p>election or re-appointment. They should not be members of existing quangos. A0267X2</p> <p>Membership of the Park Authority should be transparently fair and unbiased without any favouritism. A0283X4</p> <p>However, there is a vital lesson to be learned from Lord Nolan's recommendations for public appointments, namely that the remaining 20 positions must be advertised and the candidates interviewed. This process must be conducted by a panel with broad relevant expertise and appointments made, having regard to candidates' ability to contribute to the successful achievement of the four aims mentioned in paragraph 2 above. A0250X5</p> <p>Membership of the Authority should include strong representation from outdoor recreational and, especially, conservation backgrounds. The first three of the four aims of Scottish National Parks can only be achieved if those most concerned about and knowledgeable on the natural beauty and resources of the area have a significant input to decision making. A0350Y4</p> <p>The Nolan principles should apply and real efforts should be made to ensure gender balance - something that has been sadly neglected in the past. K0384Y1</p>
<p>Other comments Total: 3</p>	<p>H0343Y2 K0311Y2</p>		<p>A0017X5</p>	<p>While acknowledging that the broad model of representation for the National Park Authority has been set by statute, we do have concerns that a mix between directly elected and nominated members carries the risk of lack of clarity in accountabilities to stakeholders and local communities. There is also a risk of confusion in role and status between directly-elected representatives, and those representatives who are appointed on the nomination of local authorities, but who are elected members of their authorities. H0343Y2</p>

Key Issue 10: Representation on the National Park Authority. Views on the approach to share of local authority nominations				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for area-based share of local authority nominations Total: 15		A0220X4	A0052Y3 A0083X5 A0137Y4 L0302Y1 O0007Y3	<p>As the concept of a Park is about land use, the members should be appointed in proportion to the area they represent. A0110</p> <p>We would support the basis of allocation being on area rather than population given that it is the land and how it is managed which is of fundamental concern to the Park service. B0143</p> <p>If sub-units 2,3 and 5 were to be excluded, the permanent population of the Park would be small. It would thus be sensible to balance the members appointed by each of the local authorities on an area, rather than a population basis. This issue depends on the boundaries chosen. A0220</p> <p>The key aim of the National Park designation is to balance the effective protection of the natural heritage with land use interests. It follows, therefore, that Local Authority representation should be based on area rather than population. L0226</p>
Support for population-based share Total: 19		A0185X4 A0198X4	A0025X5 A0059X5 N0107Y4 N0203Y1 N0304Y1	<p>The allocation of membership between local authorities should be based on population. It is not necessary for those members appointed by Ministers to be local people so long as they have knowledge of the local issues. Ministers can use their power of appointment to appoint people with particular expertise if they felt the Park Authority was missing a particular skill. A0370</p> <p>At this stage, when the Park boundary has still to be settled, the option of allocating membership on a population basis would seem to be preferable. A0198</p> <p>SCDI disagrees with the proposals of determining Board representation on an area basis and recommends an allocation on a population basis as more democratic, particularly in relation to the modified area option B referred to previously. M0204</p>
Support for a share based on combination of area and population Total: 33	A0076X1 A0111Y2 A0236X2 A0272X3 A0322X3 B0138X3 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0381X3 J0093Y2 J0241Y2 K0222Y2 K0255Y2	A0079X4 A0108X4 A0155X4 A0277X4	A0063X5 A0087X5 A0121X5 A0183X5 D0118Y3 J0152Y1 J0352Y1 K0149Y1 K0165Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 O0289X5	<p>Recognition must be taken of both the relative populations and relative areas of each local authority within the Park area. Restricting nominations to one of these elements cannot be seen as fair and reasonable. It is hereby suggested that an equal weighting be given to area and population within the Park boundaries and the nominations distributed between local authorities on that basis. A0087</p> <p>As suggested in your document it may be that both population and area is required to allocate membership fairly. Also rotation of membership could be an alternative, and possibly certain candidates may be agreed between more than one local authority. O0289</p> <p>It is suggested on grounds of realism that there should be a combination of both population and area since it has to be practical for elected members to be able to become knowledgeable about all parts of the area that they represent regardless of the population. So some mixture of both these ingredients should be used to finalise the numbers of nominations once the area of the Park has been settled. E0399</p>

	K0269Y2			<p>LINK members are of the view that the proposed approach is appropriate. The process should take account of both population and area to ensure that all local authorities in the area are represented. No single local authority should have a majority. K0255</p> <p>The majority of Forum members feel that the allocation of membership should be based on formula which takes into account both the land area and population within the Park, weighted to take account of the spread of the population within the area. L0254</p>
Support for other approaches Total 14	A0148X3 A0163X3 A0178X1 A0319X1 A0342X3 B0146Y2 B0167X1 J0093Y2 J0224Y2		A0164X5 A0232X5 C0306Y1 J0313Y1 K0154Y1	<p>Whatever the size of the Park, local authority members should be reduced to a minimum of 5 (2 Aberdeenshire, 2 Highland, 1 Moray) and a maximum of 7 (2 Aberdeenshire, 2 Highland, 1 Moray, 1 Angus (if "in") 1 Perth and Kinross (if "in"), with the number of directly elected members increased by between 3 and 5 (or in the case of a small Park, perhaps a lesser increase in the number of directly elected members, a slight decrease in the total size of the Board. A0163</p> <p>As suggested above, the local authority representation should be equally divided between the three local authorities if the park size is to be restricted to the core area. C0306</p> <p>I believe that each Local Authority should only have one nomination and that a Councillor must represent an area within the Park boundary. J0224</p>
Comments on share from specific local authorities Total: 4	F0381X3 E0399Y2 K0222Y2	A0185X4		<p>In Aberdeenshire's case, that would be something like the 2 Upper Deeside and Donside Councillors. This would give the kind of ideal spread of local knowledge / expertise and the wider picture. Interestingly, the two local Councillors are experts in agriculture and land management. I believe that this type of makeup from a Local Authority is both practical and democratic and should form the basis of the 10 members from the LAs. This view has been accepted very readily by all the members of the area that I have spoken to in Upper Donside. F0381</p> <p>Aberdeenshire Council has already resolved that two members are to be part of the Board of the National Park Authority. They should be drawn from the Marr Area Committee and in a position to give particular local expertise in the way in which communities relate to recreation and land management with one third, or more, representatives being drawn from the Council's Infrastructure Services Committee to be able to connect issues of wider policy making to those being carried out in the Cairngorms area. E0399</p>
General comments on local authority nominations Total: 9	A0271X2 B0062X2 J0261Y2 M0373Y2	A0332X4	A0296X5 A0387X5 L0036Y3	<p>However, locally elected Councillors or community Councillors should not be nominated onto the board by the Scottish Executive or Local Authority. They are elected to represent their ward or community, not the whole park area. All park board members are required to represent the Park as a whole without preference to any area. There will be a significant conflict of interest. B0062</p> <p>3-32 describes no real constraint on any nomination that a local authority might wish to make as the 14 categories listed under the four different aims (a), (b), (c), (d) are so comprehensive that it would be hard to find somebody who did not fit into one of them. A0296</p> <p>Local authorities should not be able to nominate employees. M0373</p>

Other comments Total: 5	B0167X1 B0396X3 C0142X3	A0298X4	K0366Y1	This is an issue that can only be addressed once the boundaries of the proposed Park have been decided. While we are uncertain about the number of local authorities involved, this matter cannot be resolved. C0142 We support the membership allocation proposals, but no single Local Authority should have majority control. K0366
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------	---------	--

Key Issue 11: Potential Areas of knowledge and expertise of Board members.

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
<p>General support for proposed areas Total: 59</p>	<p>A0072X1 A0082X1 A0110X1 A0148X3 A0236X2 A0342X3 A0382X1 B0001X1 B0078X2 B0138X3 B0167X1 B0337X1 B348X1 C0353Y2 E0123Y2 E0126Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 J0093Y2 J0224Y2 J0241Y2 K0184Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 L0012Y2 L0041Y2 L0226Y2 L0260Y2 M0204Y2</p>	<p>A0079X4 A0198X4 A0280X4 A0298X4 A0367X4</p>	<p>A0059X5 A0063X5 A0043Y3 A0137Y4 A0159X5 A0183X5 C0071Y4 C0306Y1 E0145Y3 J0208Y1 J0313Y1 K0127Y1 K0132Y3 K0165Y1 K0366Y1 K0366Y1 K0384Y1 L0302Y1 L0372Y1 L0389Y1 N0050Y1 N0304Y1 O0007Y3 O0289X5 O0294Y3</p>	<p>10 specialists, e.g., forestry, geology, biology, tourism-environmental education is especially important -2LA and 1 Scottish Executive. A0082X1</p> <p>I agree that the apportionment of places equally between the aims is a reasonable way of splitting the allocations. It will be difficult to find the person with sufficient knowledge of food, farming and timber together and also the person representing recreation would have difficulty keeping all interests informed, however, in both areas there might be elected or LA appointees with appropriate knowledge. B348X1</p> <p>For those totally chosen and directly appointed by Scottish Ministers, the subjects detailed in 3.32 are very pertinent, with the exception of the last bullet point – fund raising and media relations. F0230X2</p> <p>Areas listed in 3-32 seem appropriate, ensuring there is a balance of subjects represented (an aim (a) covered). O0289X5</p> <p>We concur with the expertise highlighted, and also that no places are 'reserved', and emphasise need for members having strong National Park commitment, and good skills mix. K0366Y1</p> <p>For a National Park Authority to be effective, all the aims must be reflected in the composition of a National Park Board, with membership particularly reflecting the origins of National Parks, namely enjoying its qualities and protecting them. Such experience and expertise needs to be reflected in the group of appointees by the Minister who are not also otherwise accountable to local authorities. K0184Y2</p> <p>The subjects listed as the areas of knowledge and expertise required to meet the four aims of a Cairngorms National Park appear to be comprehensive, except for the exclusion of the Education Sector, which should be added. M0204Y2</p> <p>I note with pleasure that the nominees are supposed to have knowledge and experience in various (listed) subject arenas, and I hope that this requirement is maintained. C0071Y4</p>
<p>Support for expertise on aim 1 (conservation of the natural and cultural heritage)</p>	<p>A0030X3 A0217X1 K0221Y2</p>	<p>A0099X4 A0273X4</p>	<p>A0016Z A0045Y3 A0052Y3 A0162X5 A0245X5 A0257Y4 A0318X5 G0199Y1</p>	<p>It is essential that at least five of the nominated members are experienced ecologists or naturalists familiar with the area and with upland management and conservation issues. It is essential that the Board recognises that there have been major deficiencies in managing the landscape and natural habitats in parts of the area. A major task of the new NPA is to identify and rectify these deficiencies. A0099X4</p> <p>The plant communities in the core area of the Cairngorms and the animals they support are unique in the British Isles and exceed all but the landscape in importance. The Society feels that this botanical importance should be recognised and that some degree of botanical expertise should be available at Board level.</p>

Total: 28			<p>K0100Y3 K0127Y1 K0132Y3 K0144Y3 K0147Y3 K0151Y1 K0239Y1 K0299X5 K0366Y1 K0385Y3 L0302Y1 L0395Y1 N0349Z O0068X5 O0393Y4</p>	<p>K0299X5</p> <p>From the perspective of a public body concerned with environmental protection, SEPA supports the inclusion in the list of requisite interests and experience, of land and water management and biodiversity. G0199Y1</p> <p>With regard to the list of potential areas of knowledge and expertise that nominees and appointed members of the Board might be expected to cover, the Society has one important reservation. Under aim (a) - to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area, an extremely important area of expertise has been omitted - this is wildlife conservation or ecology. This area of knowledge and understanding will be key to a National Park Authority, and is not adequately covered by the term biodiversity within "biodiversity and earth heritage", important as this is. This is a serious omission since the Park will be a major wildlife resource, requiring good conservation practice that goes beyond the maintenance of biodiversity. K0385Y3</p> <p>We would stress the need for sound biological expertise on the Board and for the Board in turn to have ready access to a broader base of biological proficiency. N0349Z</p>
<p>Support for expertise on aim 2 (sustainable use) Total: 27</p>	<p>A0271X2 B0138X3 B0140X3 B0146Y2 B0279X2 B0287Y2 B0337X1 B0396X3 C0288Y2 D0217Y2 H0106Y2 H0252Y2 J0093Y2 J0241Y2 J0261Y2 J0307Y2 J0356Y2</p>	A0247X4	<p>C0306Y1 G0086Y1 J0070Y1 J0168Y1 J0208Y1 J0352Y1 J0403Y1</p>	<p>9 or 10 members directly appointed of which 2 members should represent agricultural land management interests (very important as there is no guarantee farming will be represented within the directly elected local members). A0271X2</p> <p>All members should have land management experience, not just views about birds and plants and rocks. Some of the English park management boards have no land management experience at all, so no wonder they are a disaster for the local farmers and residents. B0140X3</p> <p>The proposal to appoint Park Authority members with relevant experience and knowledge is welcomed. It is important that the Authority can draw on experience of deer issues, impacts and practical management. The DCS recommends that representation on the Park Authority satisfies this requirement. J0070Y1</p> <p>We suggest that it is vital that areas of knowledge of nominated members include a representative proportion of persons from within land management industries such as farming, forestry and sporting. Given the importance of each industry in the proposed areas, at least a third of appointed members should include persons from these sectors. C0288Y2</p>
<p>Support for expertise on aim 3 (enjoyment and understanding) Total: 29</p>	<p>A0110X1 A0229X1 A0210X2 A0272X3 L0012Y2 L0056Y2 L0111Y2 L0254Y2 L0256Y2</p>	<p>A0079X4 A0211X4 A0273X4 B0193X4</p>	<p>A0057X5 A0087X5 A0089X5 A0137Y4 A0243Y4 A0245X5 A0266X5 A0383X5 J0152Y1 L0175X5</p>	<p>It is very important that members of the Park Board have expertise and knowledge relevant to the Cairngorms. This should include at least one member with specific knowledge to represent recreational interests. A0210X2</p> <p>Many of the people who visit the area of the proposed Park do not live locally. No mechanism is proposed whereby their views could be represented on the Park Board. I suggest that at least one of the Ministers' nominations should be made in consultation with either major ski clubs as Scottish Ski Club or the national governing body, Snowsport Scotland. Similar representation is necessary for the other major leisure activities based in the Cairngorms. A0266X5</p>

			L0196Y1 L0291Y1 L0301Y1 L0372Y1 L0372Y1 L0395Y1	<p>In particular we believe that there must be people with skills in recreation and tourism, but with recognition that the two are very different. Tourism depends on recreation, but many within the tourism industry do not understand informal outdoor recreation. This must not happen on the National Park Board. L0395Y1</p> <p>Most skiers do not live within the proposed national park area. Their interests therefore need to be represented by one or more of the nominees of the Ministers. L0256Y2</p>
Support for expertise on aim 4 (social and economic development) Total: 13	A0019X2 C0092Y2 C0353Y2 E0104Y2 E0123Y2 H0054Y2 H0343Y2 H0343Y2 J0093Y2 J0356Y2 M0204Y2	A0295X4	K0149Y1	<p>I would suggest that local hoteliers/shop owners/business owners would be appropriate. Other persons who could be involved are people with backgrounds in finance/legal matters/medicine. A0019X2</p> <p>My Board felt that a minimum of 2 Board members should be appointed to represent the interests of Area Tourist Boards in view of the varying products and access routes between the western part of the Park area and the eastern part. H0054Y2</p> <p>Sustainable development and sustainable use of materials are both National Park aims as described in the Act, and both these areas must be represented on the Park Board. The definition of Sustainable Development should be that described in the Brundtland Report and used in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy - A Better Quality of Life, 1999. J0093Y2</p>
Suggestions for other areas of knowledge and expertise Total: 18	A0022X2 A0038X2 B0062X2 B0143X3 E0126Y2 G0157Y2 H0344Y2 K0221Y2 M0204Y2	A0079X4	G0199Y1 K0060Y1 K0165Y1 K0170Y1 N0203Y1 N0300Y1 A0336Z N0107Y4	<p>In addition whilst the new Park Authority will no doubt have access to Legal advice, I am confident that it would benefit from a member with an Environmental Law degree. // I therefore suggest that via the consultation process, at Ministerial level, the Ministry of Defence (MOD) should be requested to nominate a Services representative (at a minimum of one or two star level) with training responsibility, to attend all the new National Park Authority meetings. For with the increasing (and future) pressure and rejection of military training areas in England and Wales (on land, water and in the air), it would make economic sense to welcome and attract elements of British and the European Forces to train in the Cairngorm National Park. A0038X2</p> <p>Administrative experience. Experience of running quangos, which is what the National Park Authority is, and of what can go wrong, would be very useful to have on the Board. It might well be that this particular knowledge should be in the office of Chairman. It is interesting to note that no mention is made of how the Chairman is to be appointed. A0079X4</p> <p>As far as expertise is concerned, it would be prudent to include in the list of desirable expertise the management of community consultation and participation as this will be crucial to the success of the Park Authority. H0344Y2</p>
Support for representation of Gaelic interests Total: 11	E0080Y2	A0220X4	A0006X5 A0008X5 A0014X5 K0005Y1 K0018Y1 K0009Y3 K0021Y3 K0033Y3	<p>I am strongly of the view that knowledge of the linguistic heritage and expertise in linguistic development should be represented on the Board. A0006X5</p> <p>Membership of the proposed National Park Board should include a representative with linguistic heritage and language planning expertise. K0018Y1</p> <p>The following fields of expertise/knowledge must be represented on the National Park Board in addition to those suggested in the consultation paper: Linguistic Heritage and Language Development. It is particularly</p>

			K0218Y3	important that the latter field be included to ensure an increase in the profile and use of Gaelic within the park area. K0009Y3
Support for experience in protected areas management in Britain and elsewhere Total: 11	A0030X3 A0314X3 B0146Y2	A0091X4 A0186X4	A0162X5 A0179Y4 A0282Y4 A0318X5 L0302Y1 K0147Y3	<p>The majority of the nominations to the Board by local authorities and the Scottish Executive should have proven knowledge and expertise of National Park issues. Several of the nominations should have some international experience and/or experience from other designated areas in Britain. A0091X4</p> <p>The majority of the nominations to the Board by local authorities and the Scottish Executive should have proven knowledge and expertise of National Park issues. It would be of importance for several of the nominations to be made from those with experience from other designated areas in Britain and/or other countries in Europe. A0179Y4</p> <p>We would also argue that there should be a strong presumption for at least one member of the Board to have international experience of National Parks. K0147Y3</p>
Support for representation from adjacent areas Total: 3	K0269Y2		E0145Y3 E0246Y3	A possible option for additional representation on the Board in which members may be elected from within an external peripheral or buffer zone... K0269Y2
In favour of including representatives of organisations on the Board Total: 16	A0180X1 A0271X2 D0217Y2 H0054Y2 H0252Y2 J0261Y2 J0330Y2 L0321Y2	A0273X4	A0016Z A0124X5 A0232X5 A0275X5 A0285X5 A0401Y4 N0304Y1	<p>With regard to the background and skills of those appointed by Ministers, I believe that Ministers should be asked to choose representatives from a pre-determined list of interested organisations, or organisations with relevant skills such as yourselves, the John Muir Trust, the RSPB, VisitScotland and the like. I do not think that the choice should be left open ended. A0180X1</p> <p>The proposals seem to have a obvious omission in failing to include and therefore harness the enthusiasm and efforts of the voluntary organisations like the John Muir Trust and the RSPB and the SWT. A0124X5</p> <p>My Board felt that a minimum of 2 Board members should be appointed to represent the interests of Area Tourist Boards in view of the varying products and access routes between the western part of the Park area and the eastern part. H0054Y2</p> <p>Because streams draining the Cairngorms are of international importance as spawning areas for spring running populations of Atlantic salmon, we would like to see a place or places on the Park Board reserved for representatives of the local statutory bodies, the District Salmon Fishery Boards to ensure that issues that arise, which could affect the welfare of salmon, get the best possible input at an early stage. J0330Y2</p>
In favour of excluding representatives from organisations on the	A0148X3 A0272X3 A0370X1 B0062X2 B0138X3 B0324X2	A0198X4 D0354X4	A0087X5 A0160X5 A0183X5 J0208Y1 K0127Y1 K0165Y1	<p>Members should not represent specific organisations, but be chosen for their knowledge and experience of the Park area and its environmental, cultural and economic heritage. B0337X1</p> <p>I further agree that it would be inappropriate to reserve Board places for specific public bodies or interest groups, as long as the appointees were seen to represent a fair cross section of the main interests. A0272X3</p>

Board Total: 32	B0337X1 C0142X3 C0353Y2 H0106Y2 J0093Y2 K0255Y2 L0226Y2		K0170Y1 K0366Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 L0036Y3 L0189Y3 L0302Y1 L0389Y1 N0050Y1 O0068X5 O0289X5	<p>The statement that national or local interest groups should not have reserved places is commendable, but such interests will inevitably be represented - and this need not be a bad thing. K0170Y1</p> <p>It is vital we get rid of members who are sitting on the committee only as representatives of other organisations, each will have a hidden agenda, have no feeling for the Park as a Park, and put little into the workload which will devolve on the Park members, unless of course it falls into their hidden agendas. We need Park lovers not bureaucrats! We have a committee locally which looks after Dunnottar Woods, a mini Park, if you like. There are stacks of members, council, etc, yet all the work is done by a market gardener and a photographer, neither of which has an axe to grind. Quite frankly the rest just get in the way! C0036Y3</p>
Comments on type and range of skills that Board members should have Total: 23	A0141X1 A0148X3 A0271X2 B0138X3 B0146Y2 B0396X3 J0073Y2 J0241Y2 K0112Y2 K0221Y2 L0260Y2 M0373Y2	A0044X4	A0249Y4 A0380Y4 E0145Y3 K0149Y1 K0158Y1 L0189Y3 L0301Y1 L0372Y1 N0203Y1 O0001X5	<p>Appointed members by Scottish Ministers should be there on merit and ability to cover the various interests and cultures, whether light industry, agriculture or recreation & tourism etc. Their ability and acumen is more important than where they actually stay. A0271X2</p> <p>It must be remembered that there can be very different views among those with "interests and expertise" in any of the listed areas. There is not one single view on the listed issues, particularly on how far compromises with other interests are acceptable. The inclusion of some more "fundamental" views may make the working of the Board less easy, but would ensure that it has greater credibility. O0001X5</p> <p>The Board should have cross cutting disciplines as well as those which represent the stated statutory aims of National Parks. N0203Y1</p> <p>Board members should have substantial knowledge and expertise in a balanced range of areas of interest. These will cover all forms of land management, including recreation, agriculture, forestry, tourism and local community interests. K0221Y2</p> <p>It is important that appointees are recognised role models and have demonstrated that however strongly held their views they can reach agreement and make decisions that stand the test of time. Positive attitudes and constructive behaviour are essential for both nominees and appointees. M0373Y2</p>

<p>Comments on the need for commitment of Board members to National Park aims Total: 18</p>	<p>A0078X1 A0148X3 B0146Y2 C0142X3 J0093Y2 J0102Y2 J0307Y2 K0112Y2 K0255Y2 M0373Y2</p>		<p>A0059X5 C0306Y1 K0127Y1 K0132Y3 K0149Y1 K0154Y1 K0366Y1 L0301Y1</p>	<p>We welcome the insistence that all members of the Board must have strong connections with, and preferably reside in, the Cairngorms area, and in particular 'have a strong commitment to the overall purpose of the National Park'. A0078X1</p> <p>What is important is that none should be "single issue fanatics" or "political hacks". The members must adopt a broadminded and compromising approach in the interests of the area as a whole. B0001X1</p> <p>The list published in the proposal document is very comprehensive and verging towards idealism. It is unlikely that an even spread of expertise across all those subjects could be found in any available assembly of 25 people. There must be provision for the Board to call for expert advice on any issue. A Board selected for commitment, intelligence and an open mind ready to resolve conflicts would serve the proposed National Park better than any collection of experts, each determined to defend his own sector to the death. C0142X3</p> <p>While it is accepted that it is essential to have represented the skills involved to deal with the natural and cultural heritage of the area sadly, many individuals with these specialist interests are extremely narrowly focused and lack the ability to make weighted judgements. It may be difficult to find representatives in this area who truly have a strong commitment to the "overall purpose of national parks". B0146Y2</p>
<p>Comments on the formation of sub-groups and advisory committees Total: 22</p>	<p>A0225X1 A0382X1 A0390X3 F0230X2 H0171Y2 H0344Y2 J0216Y2 K0197Y2 K0255Y2 L0254Y2 L0268Y2 M0336Y2 M0373Y2</p>	<p>A0367X4</p>	<p>A0183X5 A0270X5 C0071Y4 J0208Y1 K0165Y1 L0291Y1 L0301Y1 L0326Y1</p>	<p>The very large area of woodland, under private and state ownership/management, particularly of naturally regenerated native species on Deeside and in Strathspey, would indicate that a forestry representative to cover both biodiversity and timber production interests is required. However it is recognised that it may be difficult with the restriction on places to appoint specifically for these subjects. In this case, there is scope to use Advisory Panel(s) when specific policies are being formulated or decisions are being made. F0230X2</p> <p>A National Park should bring together a number of Advisory Groups including a Land Based Business or a Primary Land Use Advisory Group. This should meet at least four times a year, and its membership should include at least one member of the Park Board. It is important that there are clear lines of communication between the Advisory Groups and the Board. // The Chairman of the Advisory Groups should meet together on a regular basis and encourage joint working between their membership for specific projects to ensure effective communication. J0208Y1</p> <p>sportscotland considers it important that a recreational advisory group be established to help inform the NPA and that it should be composed of the wide range of recreational interests who partake of their activity in the park. Membership could be flexible depending on the issues being discussed and should not just be restricted to recreational users but include land managers and members of the community. Any advisory group should in no way, however, act as a substitute for proper representation of recreational interests on the NPA. L0301Y1</p> <p>If it is not possible to do this effectively in the local nomination process, then I would suggest that instead of the specific issues ad hoc Advisory Groups, there be one statutory Advisory Group. This would be composed of individuals with expertise or substantial knowledge in such areas as wildlife biology management, hydrology/watershed management, forest ecology, cultural anthropology, rural development and so forth. Would the Cairngorms Working party not come fairly close to this, and provide a valuable role? C0071Y4</p>

Comments on the appointment process Total: 11	A0055X1 A0390X3 H0344Y2 J0093Y2 K0184Y2	A0139X4	A0083X5 A0087X5 K0154Y1 L0133Y3 O0007Y3	<p>My only comment is that those who are nominated or directly appointed should be carefully vetted to see that they can bring separate facilities to the task of membership. A0139X4</p> <p>Some provision is required to ensure that the Scottish Ministers nominations not only represent the National interest of the National Park but also cover the appropriate range of experience required to ensure management of the park in accordance with the four aims laid out in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. J0093Y2</p> <p>All appointments should be for a maximum of 5 years and not be renewable - this should ensure that there is a regular injection of new blood into the Park membership. L0133Y3</p>
Support for omitting specific areas of knowledge and expertise Total: 7	A0163X3 A0342X3 C0142X3	A0044X4 A0099X4	J0152Y1 L0395Y1	<p>I wish to see strong representation of interest and expertise in the natural environment, then land and water management, food and timber production, shooting and stalking, both existing interests and those offering alternatives consistent with the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. The other interests are less important though recreation and sports need to be represented. A0163X3</p> <p>As a minor point, we question the need for expertise in "fund raising and media relations". J0152Y1</p>
Other comments Total: 3	B0001X1		A0057X5 A0059X5	It seems a tall order to hope to fill all the potential areas with the number of places on offer. A0059X5

Key Issue 12: Number of local members, and number to be nominated by local authorities and appointed by Scottish Ministers

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for 5 local members Total: 19	E0126Y2 K0269Y2 L0012Y2 L0260Y2 M0204Y2	A0139X4 A0198X4 A0220X4 A0298X4	A0016Z A0045Y3 A0063X5 A0121X5 K0149Y1 K0165Y1 K0385Y3 L0302Y1 L0389Y1 N0304Y1	<p>I suggest that there be 5 'local members' on the Park Authority. If these are to consist mainly of local councillors then they will also be able to input to planning applications at a local authority level and there would be no need for more than 5 on the Park Authority. A0063X5</p> <p>In addition to five directly elected members (Key Issue 9) five further members should be appointed as 'local members' to meet the minimum requirements. E0126Y2</p> <p>Allowing 5 locally elected members and another 'local members' amongst those appointed by the Scottish Ministers strikes us as enough to assure adequate local representation, but the second 5 need not be seen as an upper limit. The Scottish Ministers should have a free hand to select the remaining members of the board, with commitment and knowledge the predominant factor, but localness not a disqualification. L0260Y2</p>
Support for more than 5 local members Total: 9	A0072X1 A0082X1 A0148X3 A0272X3 C0353Y2 F0230X2 J0216Y2 J0261Y2 L0226Y2			<p>6 nominated by LAs and appointed by Ministers as local members, 6 directly appointed by Ministers, 3 directly elected. A0072X1</p> <p>Based on a Board of 10 members, I would recommend: Local members - 3 (elected), Local Authority members - 3, Appointed members - 4. A0148X3</p> <p>We welcome the emphasis on the election and appointment of local members to the Park Board but consider that this does not go far enough. The views of the people who live and work in the Park area are essential to the successful establishment and management of the National Park. We would wish to see a minimum of 50% of the membership drawn from the local communities. This need not mean that commercial interests reign supreme, as there are many residents in the Cairngorms area representing conservation, recreation and land use interests. // Of the 20 members appointed by Scottish ministers, we would wish to see 8 'local members' appointed. L0226Y2</p>

Support for a majority of elected members (directly elected and local authority councillors) Total: 17	A0079X4 A0083X5 A0087X5 A0134X5 A0253X3 A0263X5 A0338X3 A0342X3 B0167X1 D0191Y2 E0104Y2 J0313Y1 J0352Y1	A0253X3 A0338X3 A0342X3 B0167X1 D0191Y2 E0104Y2 K0105Y2 L0268Y2 M0373Y2	A0083X5 A0087X5 A0134X5 A0263X5 J0313Y1 J0352Y1 O0007Y3	<p>I believe that half of those nominated by Ministers should be from within the area designated, and that all those nominated by Local Authorities should live or work in a designated area. If this were the case, at least 20 of a Board of 25 could claim to be local people. B0167X1</p> <p>The proposed composition represents a diminution of the present democratic rights of the local population with a built-in majority power exercised by non-resident placement of the Executive. No defence of this policy is offered. // It is considered that local representatives, whether directly elected or nominated from local authorities should together form a majority. In the circumstances I feel no obligation to justify this view. A0338X3</p> <p>The number of 'local' members should be significantly more than the minimum of 5 provided for in the Act. It is therefore suggested that both the Local Authorities and the Scottish Ministers should ensure that at least 50% of their nominees/appointees are "local". // The objective should be to establish that a majority of the 25</p>
---	---	---	---	---

	K0105Y2 L0268Y2 M0373Y2 O0007Y3			<p>Board members are 'local'. This can be achieved by the five directly elected and 50% of the Local Authorities' and Ministers' nominees/appointees being "local" (i.e. 15 out of 25). E0104Y2</p> <p>We recommend that the local authority nominees should all be elected councillors. Considerable weight is given to the political accountability of the national park board. Since only 20% of its members will be directly elected, there is a clear democratic deficit to be made up. This deficit is well satisfied by the nomination by councils of elected councillors to half the remaining places; whereas permitting councils to nominate unelected persons inserts an extra link in the chain of accountability. That extra link is unnecessary, both because the board will be advised by numerous experts on the national park advisory groups and by its own professional staff. O0007Y3</p>
General comments on the importance of Board members having local knowledge Total: 19	A0097X1 A0178X1 A0217X1 A0271X2 B0062X2 B0223X2 B0324X2 D0191Y2 E0104Y2 J0241Y2 K0222Y2	A0115X4 A0237X4	A0083X5 A0087X5 A0285X5 J0152Y1 J0208Y1 K0154Y1	<p>As said previously, there should be at least 8 locally elected members on the Park Board. As regards nominated members by local authorities, they should preferably be resident within the Park. A0271X2</p> <p>The crucial matter is to have Board members with strong local knowledge and experience. Technical advice can be "bought in" through employment of specialist staff or professional support on ad hoc basis. B0223X2</p> <p>Local knowledge and experience is of paramount importance to the membership of the Board. Having an expert on some aspect of the National Park's duties, resident and with knowledge pertinent to some distant part of the world is not usually going to be of benefit to the Cairngorm massif and its surroundings. A0087X5</p> <p>Local representation must dominate the Board and this can be achieved as, in addition to the locally elected members, the Local Authorities have the power to nominate and the Minister has the power to appoint locals too. J0241Y2</p>
Support for local authorities to use ward councillors Total: 27	A0221Y2 A0272X3 B0143X2 B0337X1 B0396X3 C0142X3 D0096Y2 D0169Y2 D0191Y2 E0399Y2 F0230X2 H0171Y2 H0344Y2 H0344Y2 J0093Y2 J0224Y2	A0004X4 A0101X4	J0208Y1 J0313Y1 J0352Y1 K0154Y1 K0384Y1 L0372Y1 N0203Y1	<p>We believe there is merit in the local members (outwith the directly elected members) being local councillors from wards within the Park, nominated by the local authorities and possibly on a rotational basis to ensure against political cherry picking. Anything to promote and increase local accountability on the Board must be worthy of support. B0143X2</p> <p>Given the range of interest and experience being looked for from the Board, I think that Councillors are too narrow a pool from which to try and draw the necessary skills. Local authorities should be encouraged to nominate a balance of councillors and others (e.g. their own professional officers, e.g. members of interest groups - I am minded to note how well the Forestry Commission's Forest Enterprise - Tayside, Environment Panel appears to work very well.) A0004X4</p> <p>Local Authorities should only have 1 nominee, who should live within the boundary. J0313Y1</p> <p>Assuming a NPA Board of 25. The split described in 3-28 appears to be equitable. Local authority nominations should include elected representatives (councillor or community councillor) with a ward wholly or partly within the Park boundary. J0093Y2</p>

	J0241Y2 K0255Y2			
Support for local authorities to have flexibility in their nominations Total: 12	A0221Y2 A0370X1 B348X1 E0126Y2 L0260Y2	A0044X4 A0364X4	C0306Y1 K0127Y1 K0366Y1 N0107Y4 O0289X5	<p>Local Authority appointees need to include those who have real influence within the local authority such as the convenor, and where there can be a choice also others who represent a ward within the Park. Excellent Local Authority/Park Board relationships will be essential to success. B348X1</p> <p>It is possible that other members of the community rather than the elected councillors are proposed. While important that the local communities can present half of the non-directly elected candidates, it is important not to get obsessed with the location of the candidate. For example a candidate that lives outwith may help strengthen links between the Parks and its surroundings. O0289X5</p> <p>It is of concern to us that local authorities may not initially think beyond their own council members and senior officials in arriving at nominations, and that some of the affected local authorities would not have within their ranks individuals with the commitment and relevant experience appropriate for membership of the Park Authority Board. We therefore hope that the Scottish ministers will make it abundantly clear to local authorities that it is a National Park which is being set up, that its board must have a make-up more representative of the national interest than a hybrid local authority, and that local authorities, or at least those entitled to make more than one nomination, are expected to come forward with suggestions which are not purely local. L0260Y2</p>
Support for maximising national interests in the direct appointments by Scottish Ministers Total: 10	A0055X1 J0093Y2 K0341Y2 L0254Y2 L0260Y2	A0044X4	A0063X5 C0306Y1 K0366Y1 K0385Y3	<p>The TGA notes that the local authorities have already suggested that their nominations are likely to be elected Councillors. The TGA supports this view and suggests that with 8 directly elected local members and 9 appointed by local authorities, there would be sufficient local representation on the proposed Board to ensure accountability. The 8 members appointed by the Scottish Executive should be selected for their experience rather than their 'local' credentials, and those with a national perspective should be favoured, recognising that the Cairngorms National Park will have a national and international context. C0306Y1</p> <p>The Recreational Forum would stress that the composition of the Board needs to include national recreational interests, with national and international knowledge and understanding. L0254Y2</p> <p>It would not be wise to limit the choice of Ministers by insisting on a set proportion of locals among those directly appointed. It will be important that all the Minister's appointees should be those with a national perspective and collectively with expertise particularly in aims a, b and c. It should be remembered that these are National Parks which may include aspects of international importance. K0385Y3</p>

Key Issue 13: The timing of Direct Elections

Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for elections before appointment of other members Total: 58	A0049X3 A0055X1 A0082X1 A0210X2 A0221Y2 A0222Y2 B0001X1 B0078X1 B0143X2 B0146Y2 B0337X1 B0348X1 B0396X3 C0092Y2 C0142X3 J0093Y2 J0102Y2 J0224Y2 J0241Y2 K0105Y2 K0184Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 K0341Y2 L0012Y2 L0041Y2 L0226Y2 L0254Y2 L0260Y2 M0373Y2	A0079X4 A0108X4 A0139X4 A0198X4 A0298X4	A0087X5 A0137Y4 A0347X5 A0387X5 C0306Y1 J0313Y1 K0127Y1 K0149Y1 K0154Y1 K0158Y1 K0165Y1 K0208Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 L0291Y1 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 L0372Y1 N0050Y1 N0107Y4 N0304Y1 O0068X5 O0289X5	<p>I suggest that elections should precede appointments by Ministers. This would allow the latter to take account of the experience and fields of expertise of the elected members. A0055X1</p> <p>To ensure the Board contains the range of experience and knowledge to properly represent all aspects of the Board's activities, Ministerial appointments should only be made once the other members of the Board are known. B0337X1</p> <p>This aspect will be dealt with in the Election Order. There would be merit in the election of local members (5) and the nomination of local authority members (10) being settled before Ministers select and appoint their 10 nominees. This would give Ministers the opportunity to fill any obvious gaps in knowledge and expertise arising from the earlier elections and nominations. A0198X4</p> <p>In order for a balance of expertise of Board members to be met it is essential that the timing of direct elections should precede the completion of the appointments and nominations to the Park Board, so that there is the opportunity for any gaps in expertise on the Board to be filled. Ideally the appointment of Local Authority nominations should also precede the direct appointments by Scottish Ministers for the same reasons. K0165Y1</p> <p>We feel that local elections should be the first stage in the appointment process, followed by Local Authority nominations. The Scottish Ministers' own appointments should be the final stage. This is the most likely process to produce the necessary balance of outstanding expertise and knowledge. A0221Y2</p> <p>They should take place before the appointments by Scottish Ministers. This would enable Ministers to achieve a balance both of and within the four aims through appointments subsequent to elections and to achieve the correct 'local' proportion. It would also ensure that those people living within the Park area whose lives and livelihoods will be most affected by the National Park, have the opportunity to set the 'tone' and be pivotal in initiating the composition of the Board. M0373Y2</p>

Support for elections after the appointment of other members of	A0072X1 A0271X2 A0342X3 A0370X1 B0223X2 B0324X2	A0211X4 A0220X4 A0367X4 D0354X4	A0063X5 A0165X5 A0297X5 J0152Y1 O0002X5 O0294Y3	<p>It would be preferable if elections for the locally elected members would follow the completion of appointments and nominations to the Park Board made by Scottish Ministers and local authorities. In particular the Chair of the National Park Authority must be appointed early. The appointments by Ministers and local authorities will give the impression of cohesion and show that the National Park Authority is a definite entity. Electors going to the polls for the local elected members will therefore feel that they are electing members to an existing, vibrant organisation. A0370X1</p>
---	--	--	--	--

the Park Board Total: 23	C0353Y2 D0169Y2 D0191Y2 E0104Y2 F0230X2 L0268Y2 M0204Y2			<p>The direct elections can only follow local authority elections and direct ministerial appointments, when prospective candidates will know that they have not been otherwise appointed, and the electorate will know who is already appointed and therefore have the opportunity of putting forward or voting for candidates to fill perceived gaps. F0230X2</p> <p>Direct elections should follow in from Local Authority nominations and ministerial appointments to avoid those who might reasonably expect to be nominated or appointed standing for election in case they are not so nominated or appointed. It also gives the Electorate an opportunity to make an informed voting decision in the knowledge of who has already been appointed to the Board. // Consideration should be given to the timing of steps 9 and 10 on page 10 of the consultation to ensure, so far as possible, that all Members take up their positions at the same time, and thus avoid any feeling that those who join later are in some way second class. E0104Y2</p>
At same time as the appointment of other members of the Park Board Total: 5		A0044X4 A0340X4	A0083X5 J0352Y1 L0036Y3	Lets have the elections and the placements announced at the same time. Should it be found that a placement has been elected then a replacement can be nominated from the reserve list. A0083X5
At same time as local authority elections Total: 8	B0062X2 A0272X3 K0112Y2	A0079X4 A0185X4	K0154Y1 K0384Y1 L0302Y1	<p>Direct elections should be held at the same time as Local Authority elections, except in the first instance because of the timescale for establishment. A0185X4</p> <p>Local elections should be held on the same day as Scottish Parliament or local authority elections so as to encourage high participation. L0302Y1</p> <p>WWF recommends that the timing of the direct elections to the NPA should coincide with those of local authority and Scottish parliamentary elections which are at fixed intervals to ensure simplicity and a good turn-out for the NPA elections. However care will need to be taken in ensuring that candidates for the NPA who might also be standing in other elections at the time do not unfairly 'piggy back' on the other election campaigns. Only after the elections should local authority and Ministerial nominations be made to allow complementary skills to be built up in the Board. K0112Y2</p>
Comments on the relationship with appointment process Total: 6	E0399Y2 J0224Y2 L0056Y2 L0056Y2 L0254Y2		J0313Y1	<p>In the early stages, it is important that the Minister and the local authority nominations list is published well in advance of the direct elections, to ensure that there is not a position where local elected members become also candidates for local member elections. E0399Y2</p> <p>Overall the timing of the direct elections and appointments should ensure a cohesive Board is established and this should not be delivered in a piecemeal approach. L0254Y2</p>
Other	B0140X3		N0203Y1	Other than suggesting strongly that the initial direct elections, along with the other appointments, should be

comments	F0381X3			made well in advance of the date of the National Park coming into operation, to allow for adequate training,
Total: 3				we have no particular view of the subsequent timing of elections, or the rotation of members. N0203Y1

Key Issue 14. Name of the National Park.				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
"Cairngorms National Park" applied regardless of size Total: 114	A0011X1	A0004X4	A0010X5	<p>Cairngorms National Park is an appropriate name. It should be made clear, however, that it includes many habitats other than mountains and should be marketed as such. J0093Y2</p> <p>We can think of no good reason for considering any name other than Cairngorms National Park. Even if the area selected includes areas which those who know the Cairngorms would say were not truly part of them, it is the Cairngorms to the exclusion of anything peripheral which should figure in the name of the Park. L0260Y2</p> <p>The Cairngorms National Park. This name is widely known. To try to rebrand it with a different name would only achieve confusion and consequently be detrimental to the achievement of at least the aim of social and economic development. M0373Y2</p> <p>It will be impossible to please everyone on this, the name 'Cairngorms National Park' is simple and straightforward, highlights the importance of the landscape feature most central to the creation of this National Park, and is readily comprehensible to the public in the rest of the UK. A0010X5</p> <p>The Cairngorms will form the core area of the Park, regardless of which of the other areas are included. There has been much use of the name: 'The Cairngorms National Park', during the development of the process. It would seem appropriate, therefore, to retain this name, which now has a strong public and media identity. To change it at this stage would be to introduce an unnecessary complication. G0119Y1</p>
	A0049X3	A0079X4	A0016X5	
	A0055X1	A0099X4	A0017X5	
	A0076X1	A0108X4	A0034Z	
	A0082X1	A0280X4	A0163X3	
	A0097X1	A0298X4	A0045Y3	
	A0148X3	A0340X4	A0059X5	
	A0210X2	A0367X4	A0062X5	
	A0213X1	A0391X4	A0090X5	
	A0219X2	K0334X4	A0121X5	
	A0229X1	10	A0183X5	
	A0236 X2		A0263X5	
	A0259X1		A0318X5	
	A0267X2		A0347X5	
	A0272X3		A0350Y4	
	A0278X1		A0368X5	
	A0312X2		A0387X5	
	A0315X1		A0392Y4	
	A0319X1		A0401Y4	
	A0322X3		B0077Y3	
	A0370X1		C0036Y3	
	B0138X3		D0195Y3	
	B0140X3		E0145Y3	
	B0143X2		G0119Y1	
	B0146Y2		J0152Y1	
	B0223X2		J0313Y1	
	B0348X1		J0352Y1	
	B0396X3		K0127Y1	
	C0092Y2		K0132Y3	
	C0309Y2		K0144Y3	
	C0353Y2		K0147Y3	
	D0169Y2		K0154Y1	
	D0191Y2		K0165Y1	
	D0202Y2		K0366Y1	
D0327Y2		K0385Y3		
E0104Y2		K384Y1		
E0126Y2		L0302Y1		
F0381X3		L0395Y1		

	G0157Y2 H0054Y2 H0252Y2 J0093Y2 J0102Y2 J0216Y2 J0241Y2 J0356Y2 K0197Y2 K0221Y2 K0222Y2 K0255Y2 K0341Y2 L0012Y2 L0056Y2 L0111Y2 L0226Y2 L0260Y2 L0268Y2 B0337X1 M0204Y2 M0373Y2 60		N0203Y1 N0300Y1 O0007Y3 O0068X5 O0289X5 O0294Y3 44	
"Cairngorms National Park" applied to option A only Total: 8	A0072X1 A0382X1 K0269Y2 3	A0139X4 A0265X4 2	A0160X5 C0306Y1 L0326Y1 3	The Cairngorms National Park is the most appropriate name for the smaller area options. K0269Y2 Cairngorms National Park is the most appropriate name for Options A and B. A0265X4 Naming the area 'The Cairngorms National Park' would presumably restrict the area to that identified at 1. Namely Option A plus Badenoch. A0160X5 The TGA agrees that the area covered by the designation will influence the choice of name. If the suggestion that Option A (the core area) is accepted then the name 'Cairngorms National Park' would be appropriate. C0306Y1
"Cairngorm(s) Mountains National Park" Total: 4		A0198X4 1	K0158Y1 J0201Y1 N0300Y1 3	The name used is of longstanding. However Cairngorm is a specific summit and reference to the 'Cairngorms' is strictly incorrect. If not considered too late the name should be altered. The OS 1:50,000 sheet identifies the area as the Cairngorm Mountains. An appropriate name for the future would be 'Cairngorm Mountains National Park'. A0198X4 We feel that the Cairngorm Mountains National Park best represents what should be envisaged. J0201Y1

<p>Support for a Gaelic or bilingual name Total: 19</p>	<p>A0180X1 H0343Y2 2</p>	<p>A0040X4 A0155X4 A0185X4 A0220X4 A0284X4 A0363X4 6</p>	<p>A0006X5 A0008X5 A0052Y3 A0137Y4 A0206X5 K0005Y1 K0009Y3 K0018Y1 K0033Y3 K0149Y1 K0218Y3 11</p>	<p>In an ideal world it would be Monadh Ruadh National Park, thereby referring to the whole mountain range which will lie at the centre of the Park, rather than the more recent and very specifically targeted 'Cairngorm'. The former perhaps conjures up a greater sense of Highland culture and history and would if nothing else prove more effective as a market branding tool. A0180X1</p> <p>Our preferred option for the Park boundary includes several locality identities, but the common link between them, and the reason for giving the area national park status, is the Cairngorms mountain range. 'The Cairngorms' already has a strong level of recognition as an area identity. Any alternatives would have to be a compound of local place names which would be cumbersome and confusing. We therefore recommend that the park name should be 'The Cairngorms National Park'. Recognising the deeply rooted Gaelic heritage of the area, a Gaelic version of the park name should be provided for in the designation order. H0343Y2</p> <p>The correct and original name of the mountains which make up the core area of the proposed park is Monadh Ruadh, the Red Mountains, form the prevalence of reddish granite in contrast the Monadh Liath or Grey Mountains of grey schist on the opposite side of Spey. Cairngorm is blue Cairn and there is only one of them! When non-Gael immigration occurred, especially since the last war they seemingly could not pronounce, then applied it to the whole range: it is not even the highest of the group. Sadly, the name 'Cairngorms' plural, is now fixed in the mind of many and I fear might be difficult to dislodge, but I wish a more accurate name was used for our National Park. A0284X4</p> <p>The name 'Cairngorms', while much in use today, is a meaningless word especially to the Gaidhealtachd. This is a sad reflection on the fact that Gaelic has become extinct in the area only within the last few years. The proper name for the mountain range which includes Cairngorm, is the Monadh Ruadh, giving it a resonance in comparison with the Monadh Liath. However it is recognised that such a radical change may be unacceptable to the majority at this time. That being so, the sensible option in English would be to give the National Park the title of the Cairngorm Mountains National Park. However a strong policy of developing bilingual road signs and place names should be adopted by the Park Authority as an early exercise of its cultural heritage responsibilities. K0149Y1</p>
<p>Support for names which reflect the wider geographic area Total: 35</p>	<p>A0019X2 A0058X3 A0097X1 A0110X1 A0141X1 A0217X1 A0271X2 A0338X3 A0382X1 B0062X2 C0075Y2 C0276Y2 J0073Y2</p>	<p>A0139X4 A0211X4 A0265X4 A0274X4 A0284X4 5</p>	<p>A0017X5 A0083X5 A0087X5 A0120Y4 A0183X5 A0297X5 A0369X5 J0208Y1 K0060Y1 K0147Y3 K0147Y3 K0158Y1 L0326Y1</p>	<p>If the Park is the planning authority, it should be called 'The Grampian National Park'. If it does not have planning powers, it should be called 'The Grampian Local Authorities Park'. The name 'Grampian' for this area is of long usage, whereas 'Cairngorm' means between Spey and the Dee. A0110X1</p> <p>I would love to see the Park christened The Caledonian National Park. It is a neutral name in memory of the great Caledonian pine forests and does away with Grampian, Cairngorm, Tayside and all others which are biased. A0058X3</p> <p>Pitlochry Civic Trust considers that the name of the National Park is important. The name 'Cairngorms' is misleading because this has in the past referred to the mountain domain and is therefore too small an area to cover the whole of Option C. The name 'Grampians' is too wide a label, with connotations which include much of the north-east of Scotland and Aberdeen. Pitlochry Civic Trust considers that a new but accurate nomenclature would be more appropriate and feels that the name should be 'Caledonia Forest National</p>

	K0105Y2 K0269Y2 L0039Y2 16		O0192Y3 14	<p>Park'. This would reflect the approximate extent of the old Caledonia Forest and would tie in well with other initiatives relating to sustainable development. K0105Y2</p> <p>What about 'Strath Spey' or simply 'Spey'? Please not 'Spey Valley': we have enough perfectly good local words without this fairly recent introduction. An alternative for Option A would be 'Baideanach' or 'Badenoch'. For Option B and more so Option C the title 'Cairngorms' is even less appropriate, as is 'Spey' or 'Baidaenach' so some non-geographic name would be more suitable. What about 'Millennium' or 'Caledonian National Park', with its associations with native pine? A0284X4</p> <p>There are 3 possibilities for uncomplicated names for the National Park: 'Monadh Liath', 'Cairngorms', or 'Grampian Mountain(s)'. The first is the Gaelic name for the mountain range of which the Cairngorm massif forms a part. This name is cumbersome to both pronounce and spell for those with no knowledge of the Gaelic. It also refers to an area greater than the extent of the Park, and so is deemed impractical. The second tends to be associated with Aviemore and skiing. This could be deemed exclusive, unless the designated area is restricted to Option A. The most appropriate name derives from the geological name for the uplands East of the Spey - the Grampian Mountains. This name would be more inclusive than just 'Cairngorm', yet not as over-encompassing as 'Monadh Liath'. This name would be most suitable for the designated areas in Option B and C. A0087X5</p> <p>The 'Cairngorms National Park' is already a recognised label in terms of the press and public and very suited to the job. However, the name 'Cairngorm' properly refers to only one summit (the blue hill) and is, historically speaking, not the real name for the entire mountain complex. The SMC Guide on the Cairngorms or Ian Mitchell's 'Scotland's Mountains before the Mountaineers' both have already referred to An Monadh Ruadh as separate to the adjacent An Monadh Liath mountains. Therefore, taking the widest perspective, the name of 'Grampians' might be better suited but as already mentioned, not so readily identifiable as the current 'Cairngorms'. With this said, the Trust has no real position in the matter. K0060Y1</p>
Disagree with the term "National Park" Total: 9	A0026X3 A0181X1 B0001X1 B0138X3 B0143X2 B0337X1 C0142X3 7	A0113X4 1	A0369X5 1	<p>The name National Park infers that it is owned by the nation and is a park primarily for recreation or environmental protection. In the Cairngorm area a wide range of individuals, businesses, trusts and government organisations own the land. Many occupy their property for purposes other than environmental protection or recreation. Many who do own or occupy property for recreation do so with the intention of providing exclusive recreation for themselves or their clients who pay.</p> <p>If the term National Park is to be used, marketing should make it clear that the land is not owned by the nation and the area is not just a park for recreation or conservation. It is a working environment owned and managed by a wide variety of interests. B0337X1</p>

Comments on the use of the name of the National Park Authority Total: 4	B0348X1 B0138X3 J0241Y2 3	J0208Y1 1	Once the National Park is designated, the National Park authority should be entitled the Cairngorms National Park Service. The word 'Service' sends all the right messages of co-operation, responsibility and duty, whereas the use of 'Authority' introduces the concept of dictate, probably from afar. This is precisely the point about which locals have expresses their concerns. B0138X3
--	------------------------------------	--------------	--

Comments on other issues - general comments on the National Park				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quote
Comments on community involvement Total: 32	A0030X3 A0076X1 A0085X1 A0095X2 A0097X1 A0173X1 A0213X1 A0267X2 B0337X1 B0348X1 D0191Y2 D0327Y2 G0157Y2 H0344Y2 J0224Y2 J0356Y2 K0112Y2 19	A0215X4 A0237X4 A0265X4 A0351X4 4	A0087X5 A0232X5 A0275X5 A0305X5 A0368X5 A0386Y4 G0125Y1 L0175X5 O0176X5 9	<p>There is far too much concern with the local population and far too little attention that this is a National Park for Scotland as a whole. It is an area, which should be in trust for future generations of all the Country. It follows that I am not in favour with 'the continuing inclusion and community development in housing, employment and the provision of services' (3.3). I have noticed over the years that a very large proportion of the population of such places as Aviemore have come from elsewhere and are not native to the locality. A0173X1</p> <p>Considerable thought should be given to how the National Park can increase the opportunities for local people (and particularly young people) to take advantage of the area we live in. This should include addressing housing and transport issues, but should also include creating more opportunities for young people to get out into the hills, to take part in outdoor activities, and to develop an appreciation of wildlife. A0076X1</p> <p>It will fail in its long-term purpose if it does not generate the support and enthusiasm of the local people. Critically, communities need further support in developing their own capacity to meet their needs, especially in the more remote areas. This can be achieved through improved local participation processes and through appropriate capacity-building programmes. One cautionary note is that there has been a considerable amount of community consultation in the area in the last few years and there are real signs of consultation fatigue. The challenge is to move to a situation where communities are active and empowered and able to engage when they wish to. H0344Y2</p> <p>I am local, born and bred, and fear that my home area is being taken away from us. I am seriously worried that too much control is to be taken away from the people whose inheritance this area is, and the criteria for change will be financial gain for individuals who claim to be working for the common good. A0351X4</p> <p>A big problem is to integrate sustainable use of all resources with social and economic development, recognising that people, and especially young people, are a vital resource within British National Parks and that, in a well managed National Park, local people should be educated to provide the main safeguard of local natural resources. O0176X5</p> <p>The main aim for the area has to be to look after the natural environment. If it is done properly, it will also attract visitors to the area, many from overseas. This will help the local communities. It has to be at an international level of quality, unlike too many developments in the Highlands. The control is too important to be left to local people. A0275X5</p>
Board membership and working Total: 25	A0103X1 A0225X1 B0337X1 B0348X1	A0367X4 A0020X4 A0186X4	A0016Z A0025X5 A0232X5 A0368X5	Changes to staff arrangements should be left until after the Board has had a period of months to consider how it should work. During that period it should be serviced by staff from other organisations on short term assignment. Once in place the Board will have to determine how it is going to prepare the Park Plan and once that is agreed then it will decide how it is best implemented. B0348X1

	M0373Y2 K0112Y2 J0356Y2 J0102Y2 B0146Y2 H0344Y2 H0344Y2		A387X5 J0070Y1 K0018Y1 K0033Y3 L0301Y1 L0372Y1 N0050Y1	<p>...the Scottish Executive must bear in mind the importance of representing in the membership a balance which does not allow the Sandford Principle to be adopted prematurely without undue care and responsibility. B0146Y2</p> <p>It is important that the Park Authority is seen as providing support to the local authorities, but not to overpower these with well-connected, personalities distracting the focus away from 'real' local issues. A0025X5</p> <p>Comunn na Gaidhlig would be willing to assist the board in identifying a suitable appointee to represent Gaelic interests on the board, as well as providing advice on the preparation of an appropriate Gaelic policy for the Park. K0018Y1</p> <p>The Deer Commission for Scotland is keen to promote the adoption of a Partnership approach and will consequently work closely with the Park authority. The members and staff of the DCS will continue to provide information and advice when required. In addition, the Commission can contribute to National Park Advisory Groups if needed. J0070Y1</p> <p>I will repeat that the proper qualifications for being on the board are, apart from the usual competencies required on any committee, understanding of and devotion to the beauty, the ecology and the freedom from industrial intrusions of the core area of the park. In this particular park, these are the things that matter. A0016Z</p>
Comments on the staffing of park authority and Park HQ Total: 29	A0038X2 A0097X1 A0141X1 A0148X3 A0267X2 A0390X3 A0394X1 B0348X1 C0276Y2 E0104Y2 E0104Y2 G0157Y2 H0054Y2 J0094Y2 K0184Y2	A0004X4 A0053X4 A0079X4 A0247X4 O0316X4	A0016Z K0385Y3 A0024X5 A0174Y4 A0270X5 D0118Y3 L0301Y1 L0389Y1 L0395Y1	<p>It should have a staff approaching a level of more than twenty, and it would be counter productive for it to be seen as the organisation which does the countryside management operation, however it does need sufficient staff to bring people and views together, to provide leadership and to help others to access the funds, knowledge and experience necessary to achieve excellence in the achievement of the aims. Decisions on this should be left until after the Board has bedded in. B0348X1</p> <p>Both public and privately funded existing ranger services presently operate with different roles and responsibilities depending on the objectives of their employer, and the areas in which they work. Some existing ranger services operate over much wider area outside the proposed boundary. Individual landowners within the NPA may want to retain control over the functions and responsibilities of ranger staff working on their land. G0157Y2</p> <p>In view of the east-west split in the populated areas of the park, every effort should be made to locate the Park headquarters in a 'neutral' location, perhaps Tomintoul, so as to avoid accusations of bias towards one side of the hills or the other, thus undermining the Park's credibility. A0079X4</p> <p>The Park offices should be distributed throughout the park. Rangers - As much of the resources of the Park as possible should be devoted to providing ranger staff. Tourists much prefer people to interpretation panels. Existing ranger services should be supported and co-ordinated as much as possible. O0316X4</p>

				<p>The Park-wide ranger service should employ staff from the existing local authorities ranger services and should recognise the special emphasis provided by the established ranger services for Glenlivet, Atholl, Braemar and Mar Lodge Estates. A0024X5</p> <p>Staffing of the National Park should also follow a system of advertising and selection. They however would come under the terms of their contracts. A0270X5</p> <p>What will be very important is that the new Authority have a mixture of different experts covering such subjects as environmental education, countryside recreation and access, tourism, land management, timber production, conservation etc. L0389Y1</p> <p>We believe very strongly that the National Park must create practical on-the-ground jobs throughout the communities that are within and just outside the Park's boundary. Scottish National Parks will not be seen as a success if they only create indoor office-based jobs at computer terminals. Work must take place out of doors if the Park is to make a real difference. Footpath management, education, litter control, and other practical tasks must be properly resourced. L0395Y1</p>
Concerns over bureaucracy and increased delays in decision-making Total: 26	A0069X1 A0097X1 A0148X3 A0271X2 A0342X3 A0394X1 B0001X1 B0048X3 B0146Y2 B0337X1 C0142X3 C0142X3 C0209Y2 D0188Y2 H0343Y2 J0224 Y2	A0020X4 A0065X4 A0220X4 A0227X4 D0354X4	A0206X5 A0232X5 A0335X5 O0007Y3 O0176X5	<p>Our clear conclusion is that the proposals are a waste of time and money. They create a new and costly bureaucracy, lots of jobs for the top boys and girls, and an inevitable flood of petty new regulations on a population already overburdened with regulation without adding any new value. A0069X1</p> <p>We feel that the Cairngorms are somewhere we have to go to. They are 30 miles away. We don't feel that they are sufficiently part of our environment to justify the increase in bureaucracy which your consultancy documents admits will develop. B0048X3</p> <p>If these structures are perceived to be failing at present, we cannot see how the creation of yet further bureaucracy will be of benefit. A0342X3</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the National Park authority will be in place to co-ordinate action, the larger the number of local authorities involved, the more difficult it will be to achieve consensus. The test must be whether that increased risk is justified by a need for common management. The arguments outlined above suggest that mostly there will not be such a need. O0007Y3</p>
Importance of building on existing initiatives Total: 25	A0015X3 A0069X1 A0109X1 A0272X3 A0322X3 A0342X3 A0342X3 B0001X1	D0354X4	A0010X5 A0124X5 G0086Y1 J0201Y1 J0208Y1 K0127Y1	<p>The Tourist Board is already empowered and paid to encourage visitors and facilities. In the Scottish Highlands responsible access to wilderness area is a normal and recognised privilege. A0069X1</p> <p>If the same level of support could be provided to the Cairngorms Partnership, it would be a more appropriate mechanism to meet the special needs of the area. B0337X1</p> <p>The Speyside Way will be partly within the Park boundary. The Council consider that the existing management arrangements should be maintained. The Speyside Way Management Group will make a</p>

	B0138X3 B0324X2 B0337X1 B0348X1 D0188Y2 H0054Y2 H0106Y2 J0073Y2 J0102Y2 J0224Y2			<p>detailed response on this issue to SNH.J0102Y2</p> <p>Landowners will obviously have a major role to play in a future National Park and the work of the Cairngorms Partnership Board and the Scottish Landowners' Federation Advisory Group have much to offer. The proposed Training Project involving local estates is a good example of the excellent work encouraged by the Partnership Board. It will be important to collate information regarding local economic development and local developments groups such as Braemar Tourism Group, Ballater Royal Deeside and the Royal Deeside Partnership should be encouraged and supported in their work. J0224Y2</p>
Changes to existing policies, initiatives, management Total: 6	A0095X2	A0020X4 A0108X4 A0228X4	J0201Y1 A0034Z	<p>The Cairngorm Partnership has, in many ways, failed to address the issues of importance. This may partially be due to the make up of their board but they have significantly failed to motivate and engage communities. The traditional forms of influence and power in the rural areas must be challenged. The land owning patterns in the area 0.6% owning 99.7% of the land is a shameful indictment of rural Scotland. A0095X2</p> <p>The Park Authority must be master of its own fate and not subject to the competitive, political, and/or 'divide-and-rule' tactics that have gone on over the years. A0228X4</p>
Role of existing designations i.e. SSSIs Total: 5			A0206X5 D0191Y2 J0261Y2 K0147Y3 O1076X5	<p>It is hoped that a National Park would make sense of the multiplicity of designations in the Cairngorms area which are designed to protect the environment but which may lead to confusion and fragmentation. A0206X5</p> <p>We would assume that responsibility for 'Natura 2000' sites and SSSIs would continue to lie with SNH, although, as a 'competent authority', the National Park Authority would be required and expected to play a significant role in achieving the management objectives for these sites, which should therefore form a significant feature in the park plan. The future of the existing National Nature Reserve is less clear, and should remain, in part, a focus for SNH's own NNR Review. However we strongly believe that something like the NNR should continue in operation, although it may be appropriate for it to become a nature reserve area within the National Park, managed jointly by SNH and the National Park Authority. K0147Y3</p>

Comments on other issues future management of the National Park				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quote
Aims of National Park Total: 30	A0141X1 A0181X1 A0229X1 B0001X1 B0143X2 B0337X1 B0348X1 H0344Y2 J0224Y2 J0224Y2 L0260Y2 L0268Y2 12	A0099X4 A0113X4 A0200X4 A0228X4 A0340X4 5	A0016Z A0044Y3 A0052Y3 A0150Y4 A0164X5 A0232X5 A0250X5 A0275X5 A0387X5 A0398X5 K0149Y1 K0299X5 O0176X5 13	<p>I wish to endorse the four aims of National Parks as quoted on page 5 of your consultation document, paragraph ES - 3, with one addition: I consider the first should read 'to conserve, enhance and restore the natural and cultural heritage of the area'. A0141X1</p> <p>I found this paper very difficult to comment on as the introduction does not reflect the thrust of the legislation in relation to the achievement of the four aims together. The over emphasis on land use, planning and ranger services leads the reader to imagine that nature conservation and public recreation are to be the main business of the Park. That would be wrong as it would leave many local interests outwith the process and lead to failure to deliver aims. B0348X1</p> <p>It is my opinion that the history of the English/Welsh National Parks has demonstrated just how difficult it is to give equal weight to visitor access and management, and to conservation of the landscape and environment... an honest commitment to conservation should be given. Not an absolute prioritisation, but rather that when visitor management or access issues conflict with protecting and conserving the landscape (man-made as much ironically is), then the conservation perspective should prevail. A0228X4</p> <p>I consider that the fourth proposed aim for the Cairngorms Park, to 'promote sustainable economic and social development of the area's communities' may be flawed for the following reasons: Whilst somewhat unfashionable in current Scottish thinking on National Parks, I believe that we must care for them for the sake of the urban majority, at least as much as for those who live in them. // I believe that to concentrate unduly on economic and social development issues blurs the raison d'être of National Parks, causing confusion about why they are to be created. A0164X5</p> <p>I feel that the four aims of the park, according to the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000, are vague. Not enough emphasis has been given to the conservation of the natural heritage of the area with too much emphasis being given to promotion of uses and developments. A0232X5</p> <p>I am fully in support of the four aims for Scottish National Parks, as set down in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. This is a truly unique landscape, which has given me enormous pleasure over many years. It merits the most skilled and diligent protection, if it is to be enjoyed by all, on a sustainable basis. A0250X5</p> <p>My initial comment is that the four aims stated for a National Park on page 11 of the document immediately give rise to conflict. The prime aim of a National Park is to enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area. The other aims are subsidiary. I feel that in the country of John Muir we should have a National Park up to international standards, not just an area of special planning controls as in England. A0275X5</p> <p>Finally we would like to remind the Reporter that the National Park designation is primarily for the natural</p>

				<p>and cultural heritage and not one designed to promote economic development. This over-riding provision should inform the decisions on both planning powers and representation. K0299X5</p> <p>Of course National Park designation may bring a range of benefits to the area but its prime purpose should be to conserve the heritage values for which it has been designated. To suggest otherwise undermines the National Park designation - one which is internationally recognised. A0044Y3</p> <p>Firstly, paragraph 2-12 states that Scotland's National Parks are to be unusual in 'promoting...economic...development'. There are many ways in which to do so, but a National Park should not be used in this way. A0052Y3</p>
<p>Future policies and management Total: 31</p>	<p>A0095X2 A0253X3 A0267X2 A0273X3 A0365X1 A0371X1 B0001X1 B0337X1 H0252Y2 H0343Y2 K0255Y2 K0269Y2 M0204Y2 M0204Y2</p>	<p>O0316X4 A0340X4</p>	<p>A0016Z A0162X5 A0245X5 A0257Y4 A0392Y4 B0323Y1 G0125Y1 J0201Y1 K0127Y1 K0384Y1 K0385Y3 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 O0007Y3 O0190X5</p>	<p>The MOD should be told in no uncertain terms to take the blistering noise of warplane jets somewhere else. We wouldn't have the army practising tank warfare on Rothiemurchus heathland. Why should we do have warplanes so obscenely destroying the peace and quiet of an area dedicated to solace? A0365X1</p> <p>Whilst conservation of the natural heritage of the area is crucial, many of the visual aspects of the upland areas which are attractive to visitors, are man-made or natural through agriculture or farming. Therefore land use and management has a significant impact on attractiveness. H0252Y2</p> <p>We all need to work together to use the limited resources so that the 'Cairngorms' and surrounding area should be environmentally in a better state to hand on to future generations to enjoy. A0245X5</p> <p>Make sure that you put in place an organisation that is capable of carefully and sensitively managing this unique environment. A0392Y4</p>
<p>Comments on zoning Total: 16</p>	<p>B0348X1 D0327Y2 J0073Y2 L0056Y2</p>	<p>A0020X4 A0113X4 O0316X4</p>	<p>A0087X5 A0057X5 A0088X5 A0089X5 O0176X5 O0190X5 A0275X5 L0372Y1 L0389Y1 L0161Y3</p>	<p>Zoning is a useful tool for management and its application in the Cairngorms was discussed in depth and reported by the Cairngorms Working Party in 1992. Zonation should be used sectorally and sensitively. The alternative could be blanket zones, such as mountain core and community, which could lead to the achievement of different aims in different zones, and so work around the requirement to achieve the four aims together. B0348X1</p> <p>Important for both Park and local authorities to agree a zoning scheme in respect of planning applications in which those area of highest conservation value receive the greatest protection against unjustifiable development, whilst those of a less sensitive nature in terms of the Park's remit require less control. D0327Y2</p> <p>There should be a core area which is kept as a true wilderness: no signs, no prepared paths, no huts or shelters. A zone outside the wilderness area more suited to the ambulant but unadventurous tourist which could filter down to the 300m contour. A0089X5</p> <p>There should be a core area in the park where the prime aim is to enhance the natural heritage of the area.</p>

				<p>The surrounding area would be a 'buffer' zone, which would be managed under the four aims stated in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. The core area would include no or very little human habitation. A0275X5</p> <p>We believe that this is the only way to ensure a logical and holistic approach to planning within the whole park area, based on a system of zoning whereby the presumption is against any development in the most sensitive areas, and appropriate and sustainable development is encouraged elsewhere. There have been a number of inappropriate developments approved in the Cairngorms area under the current planning regime, most notably the funicular. L0161Y3</p>
<p>Marketing and business image and identity Total: 16</p>	<p>A0271X2 B0062X2 D0191Y2 D0327Y2 D0327Y2 E0080Y2 G0157Y2 H0053Y2 H0054Y2 H0343Y2 H0344Y2 H0344Y2</p>	A0200X4	<p>A0089X5 L0175X5 A0232X5</p>	<p>Economic development will need to be aimed at the top end of the market. Premium tourism puts more money into the economy. Golf, fishing, shooting, quality retreats and catering. Walkers, although catering for the masses, brings very little money to small rural communities. B0062X2</p> <p>The Crown Estate warmly welcomes any opportunity to develop a strong and meaningful brand around the proposed Cairngorms National Park as this would serve as a prime vehicle for the promotion of the area's communities. G0157Y2</p> <p>Marketing initiatives for the Park must be integrated with wider destination marketing strategies. Managing this integration is a role for the ATBs. The NPA should not be involved directly in marketing initiatives, but will have an important role as a partner in strategy development, in developing tourism products and services within the Park, and where appropriate, in providing funding support. We strongly recommend that early priority should be given to identifying and agreeing environmental standards with tourism operators. H0343Y2</p> <p>National Park status may also increase a wide range of business opportunities in the tourist industry. A real fear is that planners will want to freeze the area in a time warp and prevent and interfere with economic developments. A0200X4</p> <p>As the area is managed reasonably well at present, we do suspect that if it becomes more marketable and subsequently popular as a national park it may well attract a large increase in numbers to the area. This may result in an increased amount of human impact on the area and have a counteractive effect on the natural environment. L0175X5</p>
<p>Management of Outlying areas Total: 12</p>	<p>A0103X1 B0001X1 C0142X3 J0073Y2</p>	A0094X4	<p>A0368X5 A0386Y4 B0077Y3 G0199Y1 K0239Y1 K0366Y1 L0301Y1</p>	<p>We have seen English National Parks a degree of planning blight near the edges of the Park. A business or house owner seeking development outwith the boundary may be prevented if it can be seen for within the Park. Since the owner receives none of the benefits of the Park status this is unfair. Whatever area are included or excluded there will be problems near the boundary. B0001X1</p> <p>There is a degree of interdependency between the high montane area, the surrounding moorland, high altitude scrub, the pine/birch woodlands in the high glens, extending down into the straths and the birch/oak woodlands and riparian woodlands along the watersides. The main watercourses and the agricultural land along the glens are also crucially important. The designation of the rivers Dee and Spey as candidate SACs</p>

				<p>reinforces this point. We cannot successfully apply management policies to any of these zones without applying sympathetic management policies to the adjoining zones on semi-natural vegetation. C0142X3</p> <p>It is essential that, as in the case of Conservation Areas, both management tools and economic resources are adequate to the task of covering the designated area. Similarly the regions surrounding the designated area cannot be allowed to become the dumping ground for bad or cheaper works. K0239Y1</p>
<p>Visitor services management and access Total: 59</p>	<p>A0109X1 A0141X1 A0141X1 A0172X1 A0019X2 A0027Y2 A0229X1 A0259X1 A0338X3 A0365X1 A0394X1 B0138X3 B0337X1 B0337X1 B0348X1 E0104Y2 E0104Y2 G0157Y2 G0157Y2 H0054Y2 H0343Y2 H0344Y2 J0102Y2 J0102Y2 L0041Y2 L0226Y2</p>	<p>A0200X4 A0227X4 A0228X4 A0237X4 A0295X4 A0340X4 A0351X4 A0363X4 A0367X4 O0316X4</p>	<p>A0016Z A0025X5 A0052Y3 A0057X5 A0090X5 A0177Y4 A0187X5 A0232X5 A0281Y4 A0336Z A0386Y4 B0077Y3 D0118Y3 D0118Y3 G0119Y1 K0165Y1 K0218Y3 L0196Y1 L0301Y1 L0302Y1 L0395Y1 N0023Y1 N0050Y1</p>	<p>It is essential that the most popular approach to the central Cairngorms, Aviemore, Cairngorm, Rothiemurchus and Glenmore, is in a fit state to accept 'international visitors' in advance of the opening of a National Park. The quality in this area will be the standard by which Scotland's National Parks are judged by International Markets and the World conservation movement. B0348X1</p> <p>The area is not currently ready for the additional influx of visitors which will be stimulated by the designation as a National Park. The headlong rush to designation should stop and a 'build up' phase should be started to put in place the infrastructure and services necessary to cope. Only once the systems are in place should the area be designated as a National Park. B0138X3</p> <p>The National Park Authority has powers to provide facilities for visitors. As well as developing the tourism product, this could include providing tourist information services. There will be a requirement for co-ordination of tourist information services between the National Park Authority and relevant Area Tourist Boards (ATB's) and, to avoid duplication, there would be merit in the National Park Authority contracting with Area Tourists Boards to provide park information as well as normal tourist information services. H0054Y2</p> <p>The route (Speyside Way) links to and through a number of local footpath networks. No matter how the Park authority deals with access in the wider sense across its area the Park Authority's presence on the Management Group is essential.. E0104Y2</p> <p>The NPA will need to co-ordinate, develop and implement an effective visitor management strategy, provide the necessary information and educational services, all of which will entail considerable resource management responsibilities, which can only be carried out effectively by ranger staff. (continued below) G0157Y2</p> <p>There are strong arguments for retaining local distinctiveness which the NPA in the provision of visitor information services and other services traditionally provided by ranger staff. There could be a risk that the creation of homogenous NPA ranger service might result in a diminution of quality and perhaps a lack of local focus or variety. G0157Y2</p> <p>The natural environment, particularly on the high plateau, is fragile, and although visitor pressure does not yet present a serious threat to this, in the longer term, careful management will be required to ensure that tourism access is maintained as a sustainable level. The special circumstances of the Park will create pressures and opportunities for more extensive information and interpretation services than normal. ATBs already provide some visitor information services. It is vital that duplication of effort and confusion is avoided</p>

			<p>through developing a joint information services strategy between the NPA and ATBs. H0343Y2</p> <p>The single most pressing requirement in relation to the tourism industry is to establish a highly effective process of joint working to deliver a diversity of linked and co-ordinated visitor services, with the aims of retaining people in the area for at least several days and broadening the range of experiences available. This requires a cohesive approach to developing and marketing all the characteristic features of the area ranging from access and recreation opportunities, natural and cultural experiences and awareness, to local food marketing and distribution. A National Park would provide the catalyst to make this happen. H0344Y2</p> <p>Mountain core policies - We should look seriously at extending the 'long walk in' in several fragile areas currently under pressure from visitors. There is no need for vehicular access by tourists to places like the Spittal of Glen Muick, Whitewell and Forest Lodge. We should also think seriously about removing unnecessary footbridges, such as that in lower Glen Derry. O0316X4</p> <p>My vision for the Park Authority is that it should be the glue that binds the area together in terms of high quality recreation and tourism - providing maximum information to tourists and those seeking information about the unique nature of the Cairngorms. A common approach to maps, guides, signage, trails, etc. This would benefit the area. A0025X5</p> <p>The major consideration for the Association is that the Park Authority are mindful that the cliffs, crags and mountains are our workplace and that the present free unregulated access we enjoy is continued when the boundaries of the Park are determined. N0023Y1</p> <p>It is assumed that the National Park authority as well as becoming responsible for rights of way will be responsible for implementing the anticipated access legislation. It will be important that this is the case particularly in the development of core path networks. K0165Y1</p> <p>The fragile and unique environment which exists in the Cairngorms should and must be protected. The suggestions for protecting the area should also allow access for all those currently enjoying the area. A National Park would not suddenly mean that day tips to the Devils Point would be run by Wallace Arnold and we thankfully do not have the situation as in major American Parks where people can drive throughout the area. D0118Y3</p> <p>The primary purpose of the National Park must be to preserve the area in its natural state as a wild wilderness are. This is not fully compatible with the continued promotion and encouragement of visitors to the area. A0187X5</p> <p>There is a need to prevent the degradation of footpaths. There is a need to convince people of the good sense of avoiding erosion, allowing rehabilitation, properly disposing of human waste, maintaining the integrity of camp sites and so on. A0016Z</p>
Ranger services	B0143X2 B0143X3	A0019X5 A0019X5	We note from the text that consideration is being given to replacing some existing ranger services by those employed by the Park Service. There can be few benefits from this on land which is mainly privately owned

Total: 16	C0142X3 C0142X3 A0148X3 B0143X3 C0142X3 J0073Y2 J0073Y2 E0104Y2 G0157Y2 G0157Y2		A0368X5 K0170Y1	<p>and managed. It is however a good example of how not to make use of existing resources and unnecessarily increase overheads of the Park Service. We do not support the proposal to provide the Park Service with authority to initiate by-laws. Such powers should be restricted to the fully democratic and accountable local authority. B0143X3</p> <p>We note that there are several gaps in the provision of Ranger Services in the Cairngorms. Ranger Services, at Cairngorm, for instance, provide advice to users of a wide area of the proposed National Park, although their responsibilities are supposed to be focused on the needs of their employer's land. This seems to indicate that the National Park should inaugurate a Ranger Service of its own. J0073Y2</p> <p>The Council's Countryside Ranger Service in Badenoch and Strathspey would need augmenting if parts of this Area were omitted from the National Park boundary and present staff were transferred to the NPA. E0104Y2</p> <p>We recommend that there is a centrally co-ordinated ranger service - if not a Park-controlled service then at least an umbrella or forum whereby all ranger services should have connections to an Advisory Group, and this Advisory Group should include people who are disabled or the very least people who work in disability organisations. K0170Y1</p>
Cultural heritage, including Gaelic and historical enhancement Total: 19	A0370X1 K0311Y2 E0080Y2	A0004X4 O0316X4	A0006X5 A0008X5 A0008X5 A0014X5 A0016Z B0323Y1 K0005Y1 K0009Y3 K0018Y1 K0021Y3 K0033Y3 K0218Y3 K0235Y3 K0264Y1	<p>It is important that the issues of cultural heritage, social or environmental matters do not overshadow the necessity for a local economy to flourish and thus provide a community that is sustainable. Experience in the area shows that, if cultural and environmental factors are given more prominence than economic factors, the community eventually drifts away. A0370X1</p> <p>The area is not part of the Gaithealtachd, nor has it been for a considerable length of time. Whilst rangers and park staff should be able to correctly pronounce mountain names etc. and be familiar with the social history of the area, we should focus on the rich culture of the present population, instead of trying to recreate a lost culture. We should present interpretation and tourist information in as many languages as possible. Selection of languages should be based upon the anticipated number of visitors who speak the language in question. O0316X4</p> <p>The promotion of the Gaelic language and culture within the Cairngorms, should, therefore, be given priority because of the importance of the language and culture to the heritage of the area. As recently as within the last thirty years, native Gaelic speakers resided within the area and the vast majority of rivers, mountains and countryside names throughout the area have their origins from Gaelic. The Park board will have an important role in promoting the history, heritage and traditions of the area through current school curriculum programmes, including Gaelic Medium Education. K0018Y1</p> <p>Given the national focus and importance of the Park, the approach to recruitment and training, public relations, and signage and literature contained in the SNH Gaelic Policy (July 2000) be adopted for the park for dealing with the local and national Gaelic communities. This should include bilingual information and interpretative signage, Gaelic educational materials and ranger service, and bilingual website and annual reports. The post of a Gaelic Officer, as in the SNH policy, would help implement the policy. K0033Y3</p>

Housing and waste management Total: 14	A0049X3 A0273X3 A0342X3 A0394X1 D0191Y2 D0327Y2 E0104Y2 K0184Y2	A0020X4 O0316X4 A0340X4 A0351X4	A0035X5 L0395Y1	<p>A key issue for the National Park will be affordable housing, and so additional resources should be provided to agencies responsible for this. E0104Y2</p> <p>[NPA to] have power to provide a solution to affordable housing and to improving infrastructure like roads and transport. High standards have funding implications - need substantial core funding to satisfy needs. Levy on second homes. Park should have power to ensure that second home owners pay a levy to the Park, to go some way towards controlling house price increases with desirability of home ownership in a National Park. D0191Y2</p>
Land-scaping and good design standards Total: 11	A0141X1 A0271X2 G0157Y2	A0020X4 A0091X4	A0047Y3 A0137Y4 A0137Y4 A0206X5 K0042Y3 K0239Y1	<p>Villages would be maintained to the highest possible practical and aesthetic standards with due reference to the cultural past of the area as well as a viable future. Aviemore, for example, is just a disgrace. Ruined cottages and steadings could be restored and provided with electricity, water and reasonable access tracks so that virgin ground need not be used for housing. A0141X1</p> <p>Despite the efforts of bodies such as the Aviemore Partnership, there are very few exemplars of good design within this whole area, measured in terms of architectural and environmental awards. In common with other National Parks in the UK, there would also be merit in establishing best practice through design guidance. Decisions could then be made by officials based on sound and consistent design principles. K0042Y3</p>
Use of local materials Total: 2	A0019X2 G0157Y2			Where goods are sold through the auspices of the Park Authority then these should in our view be produced locally so far as possible. G0157Y2
Agriculture Total: 12	A0141X1 A0365X1 B0279X2 E0104Y2 F0381X3 J0216Y2 J0356Y2	A0020X4	C0360Y3 G0199Y1 J0352Y1 K0127Y1	<p>Crofters and tenant farmers will need to clean up their act, clean up the ugly midden heaps that so many hill-farms are: close the open pits exhibiting dead carcasses, eliminate the winter lakes of sour-smelling slurry oozing out of steadings: do away with heaps of rusting machinery and detritus that blight the scenery. A0365X1</p> <p>My lambing parks are both sides of the River Trium. The left bank is uncultivated while the right bank is permanent pasture. The bird life is markedly different on either side. On the permanent pasture 22 golden plover, over 60 lapwing and 45 oyster catchers, while on the other side, snipe, skylark, redshank, greenshank, curlew, swallows, linnets and various ducks. This simple example shows how farming compliments nature in the raw, the recent RSPB survey on Strathspey waders shows this. B0279X2</p>
Deer management Total: 10	A0141X1 E0080Y2 J0331Y2	A0020X4 A0237X4 A0328X4 O0316X4	A0016Z A0045Y3 J0070Y1	<p>From a deer management point of view, it is essential that the present level of professional management input is maintained and this can only be achieved if the estates and other businesses which carry out that function remain economically viable, to the extent that they can sustain present levels of local employment. J0331Y2</p> <p>It is important that the authority can draw on experience of deer issues, impacts and practical management. At present, there are a number of deer management plans, at various management levels and different stages of development, within the proposed area. J0070Y1</p>
Biodiversity, wildlife	A0365X1		A0017X5 A0057X5	The NPA should use its powers to prevent the building of artificial structures, banks, obstructions in rivers and lochs and should take steps to restore as many waterways as possible to their natural state, implying

conservation and water catchment management Total: 8			K0147Y3 K0385Y3 L0372Y1 N0050Y1 N0349Y1	high water quality, natural river banks, natural river channels and a minimum of water extraction consistent with maintaining a free flowing ecosystem. I, and I believe all canoeists, deplore the unnecessary modifications to river banks and bed which have been made by many landowners, apparently without any restriction or planning permission required. A0057X5
Education Total: 7	A0022X2 A0394X1 H0343Y2	A0053X4	A0119X5 C0360Y3 L0395Y1	I would also like to suggest that we create and locate a new 'University' faculty (linked to Inverness University, Aberdeen, Glasgow or Edinburgh) in the centre of the Cairngorms National Park. I am absolutely convinced that such a University, which could study wide and diverse subjects from forestry to Scottish history, would be an internationally attractive and high profile option, for student is world-wide. The spin-offs in accommodation, entertainment, sport and retails outlets would be immense. A0022X2 Interpreting the National Park will be a major role for the park authority and it is important that this task is carried out well. Gateway centres must be identified and facilities set up to welcome visitors, especially first time visitors, to the National Park. We believe that the National Park should have a very active educational role. L0395Y1
Health and safety issues Total: 5	A0038X2 A0130X1 A0394X1		A0119X5 N0023Y1	In the National Parks and Mountain areas of some countries regulations are in place as to whom may carry out the business of Mountain Guiding. We are aware of the issues involved in such regulation and we are also mindful of the safety issues that may arise with unqualified tuition in mountain areas. N0023Y1
Grants and incentives Total: 3	E0104Y2 G0157Y2 J0356Y2			We applaud the commitment to utilise positive incentives to support land management. G0157Y2 One important aspect of additional funding will be improved arrangements for agri-environmental farm schemes within the National Park area. E0104Y2
Information technology Total: 3	A0022X2		A0232X5 C0207Y3	We must appreciate that information technology is the vehicle through which prosperity can be brought to the Highlands, by ensuring easy access and customer satisfaction, for all those who wish to make contact with their Scottish heritage. A0022X2 It is widely accepted that modern telecommunications are an essential and beneficial element of life in the local community and in the national economy. While telecommunications can be of benefit to local people in everyday life, in line with the main aims of the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000, which encourages sustainable use and the promotion of public enjoyment and recreation in the area, we would suggest that telecommunications will be an integral part of its success. C0207Y3
Police/enforcement issues Total: 3	A0322X3		A0174Y4 A0232X5	Are the staff on the ground going to have necessary enforcement powers to deal with problems? I know that Rangers are not known for enforcement, but I feel they should have some power to help them do their job more efficiently. A0174Y4
Transport and traffic issues Total: 2	H0344Y2 J0102Y2			Other powers which might be considered could be targeted grants etc., and traffic reduction and promoting alternative forms of transport. J0102Y2
Moorland	A0141X1			I would like to discuss some of the necessities for a district, viable National Park area. The mistaken idea

management Total: 1				that burning heather would provide an endless supply of game birds has now been shown to be completely false, as the ground, deprived of nutrients from dead and decaying plants and animals, is now totally exhausted, with much of its microflora and fauna lost, possibly for ever. An active programme of restoration and regeneration could still produce an area of outstanding scenic beauty with nature flora and fauna which would truly merit the name of 'National Park'. A0141X1
Minerals/ mining Total: 1	C0153Y2			It should also be noted that the quarrying industry is a significant employer in rural economies and, such, any development proposals which stimulates the prospects of new, or the retention of existing, employment should form an integral part of the NPA's responsibilities. C0153Y2
Monitoring and research Total: 1	E0399Y2			Research work and monitoring on planning issues in the Cairngorms might not be as focused where the function is divided over several authorities. E0399Y2

Comments on other issues - the process of Consultation				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Stated reason
Positive comments on report/leaflet Total: 16	B0001X1 J0093Y2 K0112Y2 K0255Y2 L0041Y2	A0020X4 A0040X4 A0198X4 A0340X4	A0017X5 A0119X5 D0018Y3 K0127Y1 K1064X5 L0302Y1 N0349Y1	<p>As regards the areas of knowledge and expertise of persons to serve on the Park authority, the Association considers that this is well set out in the consultation paper. L0041Y2</p> <p>The consultation document is commendably clear in layout and content. Section 2 sets out how a national park would work and identifies a range of issues and opportunities (2.12-2.14). A0198X4</p> <p>The consultation is most welcome. Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) is to be congratulated for producing a well-prepared document that identifies the key issues clearly in relation to the area, boundary, powers and representation of the governing Board of the proposed National Park. N0349Y1</p>
Negative Comments report/leaflet Total: 19	A0003X1 A0097X1 B001X1 B0138X3 B0324X2 B0337X1 B0348X1 C0260Y2 J0261Y2 K0184Y2	A0020X4 A0020X4 A0094X4 A0198X4	A0089X5 K0021Y3 C0051Y3 C0207Y3 K0388Y3	<p>Both papers ignore zoning, of crucial importance in National Parks and other protected areas abroad, and omit experience of National Parks elsewhere in the world. A0020X4</p> <p>On p12, we learn that -The National Park authority 'may' have a role in development control and local plan preparation, and be a statutory consultee to the structure plan. Does the 'may' also refer to local plan preparation? The document also omits to clarify the role of the National Park authority in relation to adjacent areas, outside the National Park. Conversely, Table 2 - Summary of the key scheduled powers for the Cairngorms National Park Authority (p24) suggests that the National Park Authority will be the planning authority. The consultation document was confusing about this topic. K0388Y3</p>
Positive comments on consultation process positive Total: 9	B0348X1 C0258X3 E0104Y2	A0332X4	O0068X5 K0060Y1 K0154Y1 L0302Y1 A0047Y3	<p>I recently had the good fortune to attend a very informative open meeting at the town hall in Pitlochry, hosted by yourselves. I think that any proposals for National Parks are to be commended. Anything that goes towards protecting the very things that tourists associate Scotland with in a positive light, ought to be encouraged. Whoever is behind such moves are to be congratulated. C0258X3</p> <p>We also welcome the thorough way in which SNH have carried out local consultations within the proposed park area. L0302Y1</p>
Negative comments consultation process negative Total: 9	A394X1 B0167X1 F0381X3	A0020X4 A0020X4 A0332X4 A0020X4	L0395Y1 O0176X5	<p>Although there has been a big effort by SNH and others the proposals, widespread publicity has been lacking so that attendance at meetings has been disappointing. But whether attendance would have been much better if publicity had been adequate is doubtful. Most people seem to be apathetic because they can't see what difference a National Park is likely to make in their lives. O0176X5</p> <p>It is possible that the extensive consultation process necessarily results in insufficient practical detail to excite the interest of the general public. A0332X4</p> <p>We are deeply concerned about this current consultation exercise. The consultation document does not attempt to analyse what has gone wrong with the existing system, and we believe that this paper should have explained why a National Park is required in north east Scotland, and what the current problems are</p>

				that could be addressed and remedied by the introduction of a National Park. Without this appraisal of where we are now and how we arrived here, it is difficult to plan our way forward. L0395Y1
Comments on SNH's role Total: 5	A0225X1 B0337X1 B0337X1 K0255Y2		C0051Y3	<p>The use of SNH as reporter in the consultation process has perpetuated the mistrust many members of the local community have of the National Park proposals and the consultation process .B0337X1</p> <p>Nevertheless, some member bodies retain doubt about the wisdom of SNH's dual role - that is, acting as both 'reporter' under S.3 of the national parks (Scotland) Act 2000 and as advisor on natural heritage. This is, however, a matter for the Executive which, we believe, they should consider carefully in advance of further consultations. K0255Y2</p> <p>The most important observation that I have, is that no one is 'selling' the concept of National Park status, anywhere in Scotland. C0051Y3</p>

Comments on other issues - Direct Elections				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Stated reason
Origins of elected/ electorate Total: 10	B0337X1 C0309Y2 D0327Y2 E0104Y2 J0093Y2 K0269Y2 L0041Y2	A0004X4 A0037X4	D0195Y3	<p>If the National Park Authority were to be given such powers, residents within a peripheral or buffer zone outside the National Park boundary could be eligible for election onto the National Park Authority Board and qualify for the benefits received inside the National Park.K0269Y2</p> <p>Given the apathy shown at local elections we envisage some problems in the instruction that five members of the authority should be directly elected but could not come up with a solution. Adopting Option B as the border of the park would at least give a larger pond of population in which to fish for representatives. D0195Y3</p>
Method of voting/type of ballot Total: 3	J0093Y2 E0104Y2	A0037X4		<p>A postal election may therefore be the most effective way of ensuring a turnout large enough to reflect a fair and representative election. J0093Y</p> <p>This would probably be easiest run as a postal ballot, with election material made available through libraries and so on where interested parties could find out about candidates, or posted to those who register an interest in the process. A0037X4</p>
Split area into wards Total: 1	B0337X1			As it is the land rather than the population that is primarily being managed we would prefer to see membership based on adequately representing all aspects of the land and the activities that depend on it. Ideally the National Park area should be split into electoral wards of approximately equal area with one successful candidate being chosen from each area. B0337X1
Depolitise Total: 1	J0093Y2			We also concur with the view that every opportunity should be taken to 'depoliticise' the elections. Bearing these views in mind we recommend that the National Park authority elections should avoid those being fought by political parties. J0093Y2
No need for direct elections Total: 1	A0236X2			It does not need any directly elected members, since the LAs and Community Councils should already provide appropriate members. There should be no direct elections since not a single reason has been given for them. Therefore, the issue of timing is irrelevant. A0236X2
Term of office Total: 2	A0342X3 F0381X3			One is the need to have a finite time for appointed members on the Board and I suggest that a maximum of two terms of 4 years would be appropriate. F0381X3

Comments on other issues - Costs of the National Park				
Category of response	Inside	Adjacent	Outside	Selected quotations
Support for adequate funding Total: 15	A0030X3 A0271X2 A0394X1 B0337X1 D0191Y2 H0171Y2 J0093Y2 J0241Y2 J0261Y2 K0184Y2 K0221Y2	A0277X4	J403Y1 K0042Y3 K0239Y1 N0194Y1	<p>If the Cairngorms National Park is to be synonymous with quality, additional funding is essential. // The proposed level of funding and the possibility of this funding continuing are unclear. It would help if there was assurance that funding will significantly exceed the cost of paying for the extra layer of administration and that this funding in excess of administration costs will continue for all the time the area is designated a National Park. B0337X1</p> <p>The other fundamental issue, not addressed in the Consultation document, is resourcing of the NP. Whilst it is clearly impossible to talk of figures at this stage, it will be essential that adequate staff and other resources are provided if this exciting new approach to sustainable land management in Scotland is to be a success. A0277X4</p> <p>Members also express concern that the implementation of the proposals needs to be adequately funded and look forward to further detailed information on this aspect. N0194Y1</p> <p>Large amounts of capital having been removed by taxation, reduction in inheritance, petroleum and Value Added taxes could achieve greater spending with fewer officials and interference and much greater knowledge and experience of the conditions unique in the British Isles. There is no guarantee that future administrations will continue to fund National Parks and no assurance that the present pressure of tourism will continue. A0394X1</p>
Comments on relationship between funding and size Total: 10	B0337X1 B0324X2 E0399Y2 J0356Y2 K0341Y2 L0041Y2	A0332X4	A0131X5 A0164X5 J0208Y1	<p>Inevitably there will be a finite amount of money to run the Park and a small adequately funded Park would be much more preferably to large Park poorly funded. J0224Y2</p> <p>The resources made available to manage the park must also reflect the requirements of the Park, and should not be predetermined. We find it extraordinary that the core operating costs have been identified (Annex 2) when the boundaries and full functions of the Park and Park Authority have yet to be decided. A0131X5</p> <p>The Association considers that the most important thing at this time is to ensure that whatever land is designated, there must be adequate resources available to ensure that the job is done well. If this means starting with a limited area, then this would be preferable to taking on more than can be properly handled with the resources available to the Park Authority. L0041Y2</p>
Implications for other areas and agencies Total: 3	B0348X1 E0104Y2 H0344Y2			<p>To meet the aims, additional costs to government are likely to arise in the following areas of operation: Community involvement, in setting direction and standards, and leadership; Housing to rent; roads; transport; sports and community facilities; training and enterprise; education; biodiversity, including farming, forestry, moorland and wetland management; public recreation; information and promotion; scenery and the built heritage. All of the above are functions currently carried out by existing organisations, many of which regard their Cairngorms activity as peripheral to their main duties. B0348X1</p>

Comments on sources of revenue Total: 11	A0110X1 A0267X2 A0342X3 C0309Y2 D0191Y2 D0327Y2 L0039X2	A0020X4	A0134X5 L0175X5	<p>It needs to be established at the outset that the Park should have a broadly neutral impact on the policies and funding capabilities of strategic agencies and that additional costs should be met centrally. H0171Y2</p> <p>The Park Authority should receive Local Authority contributions to cover its role as planning authority. A0110X1</p> <p>FUNDING: Should be 'new' money from Treasury. A0267X2</p> <p>I feel funding would be best coming from central Government. If it were to be raised locally through taxes or entry fees I am sure it would be unpopular and cause resentment of the Park Authority or whoever was to raise it, also it would be difficult to police and expensive to operate. I can however see funds being raised locally as well, possibly by selling branding rights or by charging for the right to sell branded goods. L0039X2</p> <p>It may well be that a radical re-orientation and integration of present public spending in the two areas, with emphasis on conservation and allowing natural processes without interference to speed up change, would cost taxpayers far less than now. With this approach there might well be no need for many new staff and a bureaucracy to support them. However, this fundamental analysis, which ought to have been the necessary centre of SNH's preparatory work, has been ignored. A0020X4</p> <p>Local rates must not increase. As it is a National Park, all should pay. D0191Y2</p>
Suggestions for programme spend Total: 15	A0267X2 B0146Y2 B0402X1 E0104Y2 G0157Y2 J0102Y2 J0330Y2		A0090X5 A0275X5 A0398X5 J0208Y1 L0301Y1 L0395Y1 N0349Z O0176X5	<p>Enhanced environmental schemes for farmers in the park; grant for stock accommodation to stop poaching and ESA workload; grants to upgrade tourist accommodation B0402X1</p> <p>Payments in the 2001 Rural Stewardship scheme are improvements on previous schemes. It is vital that the NPA has sufficient financial resources adequately to subsidise potential entrants to a stewardship scheme in the National Park. O0176X5</p> <p>It will be important to ensure that spending is spread throughout the area of the Cairngorms National Park and is not seen to be solely in the core area. Spending should be commensurate with the needs of each area. L0301Y1</p> <p>A key issue for the National Park will be affordable housing, and so additional resources should be provided to agencies responsible for this. // Another key issue within the National Park will be agricultural support. One important aspect of additional funding will be improved arrangements for agri-environmental farm schemes within the National Park area. E0104Y2</p> <p>Annex 2. Programme costs. We trust that the "support for land management" will include support for fish and fisheries and other aquatic issues. To clarify. We suggest that "and water" is inserted after "land". J0330Y2</p>
Proposed funding is insufficient	B0348X1 B0223X2 A0148X3		J0208Y1 L0291Y1 L0301Y1	<p>No real financial assessment has been done. What will be the cost of an effective rangering service? Does the political will exist for the Park to have adequate resources? B0223X2</p>

Total: 9	A0272X3 B0146Y2 E0399Y2			<p>We are also puzzled that the very important matter of funding is not addressed in any detail within the Consultation Paper even though it is a matter on which SNH must report to Ministers. This is a crucial part of the overall picture, without which it is very difficult to make sensible comments on many of the other issues. J0208Y1</p> <p>The current proposal for staffing and other core costs appears adequate to sportscotland. The programme costs, however, given the scale of management and capital projects required, in sportscotland's opinion, is underestimated. The balance between core costs and programme costs, it is considered, needs to be weighted more towards the latter. L0301Y1</p> <p>The resources which would seem likely to be made available to the proposed Cairngorms National Park appear to be grossly inadequate for the purpose. Suggested revenue expenditure of £2m needs to be placed in context with the fact that the Upper Deeside Access Trust which focus on footpaths and management and visitor and responsible access accounts for some £250,000 of expenditure each year. E0399Y2</p>
Information provided in consultation document is inadequate to provide comment/ other comments Total: 2	B0143X2 G0157Y2			<p>The section on funding strikes us as being somewhat on the brief side and it is not entirely clear to us as to how the indicative figures have been arrived at, but presumably the Park Plan once adopted will clarify the position. G0157Y2</p> <p>As a final point, it would be helpful to be better informed on how the Programme Costs will be broken down and we understand the Executive and SNH will be discussing this issue between now and July. We would be interested in being involved as a consultee bearing in mind the importance of the outcome. B0143X2</p>