

### Section 3: Analysis of summary leaflet responses

3-1 This section of the report summarises the information received on the summary leaflet response forms. Table 3-1 lists those people, who sent in response forms during the consultation period, listed according to the categories in Section 1. Table 3-2 gives a breakdown of respondents to the summary leaflet, showing the number of summary leaflet responses falling into each response category and geographic origin category. Tables 3-3 to 3-9 illustrate the main issues arising in the responses to the summary leaflet with a number of quotes from selected responses.

**Table 3-1: Individuals and organisations who submitted a written response using the summary leaflet**

Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee	Response code	Geog. Origin	Respondee
A1	X2	Mr D Day	A2	X1	Mr D Fullerton
A3	X1	Mr G Rimell	A4	Y4	Mr A Mackinnon
A5	X1	Mr R Beattie	A6	X2	Mr J Mauchline
A7	X1	Mr R L Pott	A8	X1	Mr B Hepburn
A9	X4	Mr J Milne	A10	X1	Mr S Heriman
A11	X1	Mr R Adams	A12	X1	Mr I Forsyth
A13	X2	Mr R Lawson	A14	X1	Ms S Ramsay
A15	X2	Mr G Mortimer	A16	X2	Mr K Robb
A17	X1	Mr D Torrance	A18	X4	Mr T Ward
A19	X3	Mrs J Bruce	A20	X1	Ms A KeillerGreig
A21	X3	Mr T Murray	A22	X1	Rev K Angus
A23	X2	Mr I Mackenzie	A24	X2	Sir H Forbes
A25	X1	Mr J Schcneman	A26	X4	Mr D McLaren
A27	X3	Mr J Irvine	A28	X4	Mr C Burbidge
A29	X3	Dr J Cummins	A30	X4	Mr P Grace
A31	X2	Mr A Foulkes	A32	X2	Mr R Donaldson
A33	X2	Miss P Auld	A34	X2	Mr K Tainsm
A35	X2	Mr P Kent	A36	X1	Mr W Houston
A37	X3	Mr C Murray	A38	X2	Mr I Brown
A39	X3	Mr D Watson	A40	X2	Mr R Preston
A41	X1	Mr A Millership	A42	X1	Mr C Lohr
A43	X3	Mr P Watt	A44	X1	Mr C Ramsay
A45	X1	Mr S Gray	A46	X4	Mr K Bagot
A47	X4	Mr S Calvin	A48	X2	Mr W Hay
A49	X3	Mrs S McGlone	A50	X1	Mr A Adams
A51	X3	Mrs J Marchant	A52	X3	Col C Russell
A53	X4	Mr R Gordon	A54	X1	Ms M MacCormick
A55	X2	Mr B Gordon	A56	X1	Mr S Campbell
A57	X4	Miss J Forbes-Sempill	A58	X4	Mr A Meade
A59	X4	Ms C Smeaton	A60	Z	In Confidence

A63	X4	Mr A Ryndycz	A64	X4	Mrs J MacFarlane
A66	X2	Mrs M Gordon	A67	X4	Mr & Mrs J Stewart
A68	X3	Mr C Taylor	A70	X4	Mr R Jaffray
A71	X2	Ms J Hartree	A72	X3	Mr B Adams
A74	X3	Mr L Carr	A75	X3	Mr J Luscombe
A76	X3	Mrs L Fleming	A77	X1	Mr C Philip
A78	X2	Mr J Akel	A79	X3	Mrs B Ward
A80	X3	Mr A Halliday	A81	X4	Mr J Morrow
A82	X4	Mr S Dakers	A83	X4	Ms L Wood
A84	X4	Mr J Buick	A85	X3	Mr P Brodie
A86	X1	Ms S Murray	A87	X4	Mr D Mckenzie
A88	X1	Mr R Drever	A89	X1	Ms H Powell
A90	X3	Mrs D Coker	A91	X1	Ms S Thomson
A92	X1	Mr Jones	A93	X3	Mr G Jarvis
A94	X4	Mr G Beer	A95	X3	Mr G Brown
A96	X3	Mr M Noble	A98	X3	Mr K MacDonald
A99	X3	Mr S Hauxwell	A100	X2	Dr I Kerr
A101	X4	Mr M De Klerk	A102	X1	Mr A Hunt
A103	X4	Ms D McGregor	A104	X3	Mr K Jones
A105	X3	Mr G Pont	A106	X4	Mr W McGibbon
A107	X1	Mr L Skuodas	A109	X4	Mr G Macnab
A110	X1	Mr C Niven	A111	X4	Family Main
A112	X3	Mr M Wilson	A113	X4	Mr J Welsh
A114	X2	Mr D Grant	A115	X1	Mr W Ormandy
A116	X4	Mr H Murphy	A117	X1	Mr J Davidson
A118	X1	Mr R Cunning	A119	X3	Ms S Gibb
A120	X4	Mrs G Hamilton	A121	X4	Mrs D Manzi
A123	X4	Mr A Fraser	A124	X5	Mr C Speirs
A125	X3	Mr R Horobin	A126	X4	Mr J Cumming
A127	X4	Mr M Gervaise	A128	X4	Mr P Laverman
A129	X1	Mrs R Booth	A130	X5	Mr W Keir
A132	X4	Mr P Kinnear	A133	X2	Mr A Rafferty
A134	X1	Mr D Miller	A135	X1	Mr G Smith
A136	X4	Mr D Adams	A137	X3	Mr M Hewitt
A138	X3	Mr A Robb	A139	X3	Mr R Thom
A140	X4	Mr A Welch	A141	X5	Ms H Williams
A142	X4	Ms I McInally	A143	X3	Mrs S Macpherson
A144	X4	Ms O Evans	A145	X4	Ms H Riddell
A146	X3	Mr A Smith	A147	X4	Mr R Brown
A148	X1	Mrs J Benson	A149	X2	Ms K Elder
A150	X5	Mr P Jaffrey	A151	X2	Mr D Elder
A152	X4	Ms K Barrett	A153	X1	Mr T Mackenzie
A154	X4	Mr D Burfitt	A155	X1	Anon
A156	X1	Anon	A157	X1	Mr J Nicoll
A158	X1	Mr L Street	A159	X4	Mr C Norrie
A160	X4	Ms C Petch	A161	X3	Ms S Robertson
A162	X3	Mr M Preece	A163	X1	Ms C Hutton

A164	X2	Mr A Miller	A165	X4	Mr G McLean
A166	X4	Mr M Simpson	A167	X4	Ms K Black
A168	X3	MR R Wallis	A169	X3	Mr G Keates
A170	X3	Mr M Philip	A171	X1	Mrs S Elliott
A172	X1	Mr J Pott	A173	X4	Mrs M Mackie
A174	X1	Mr I McLachlan	A175	X4	Mr N Grieve
A176	X1	Mr B Mackay	A177	X4	Mr N Robertson
A178	X4	Ms P Purkis	A179	X3	Mr F Cochrane
A180	X1	Mr H Attwood	A181	X1	Mr W Mackenzie
A182	X1	Mr J Penny	A183	X1	Mr P Main
A184	X3	Mr T Shaw	A185	X3	Dr S Walker
A186	X3	Mr C Cornwall	A187	X1	Mrs H Mutch
A188	X2	Mr I Hay	A189	X2	Mr R Heslop
A190	X2	Ms R Marks	A191	X2	Mr B Whyte
A192	X2	Mr W Lannagan	A193	X1	Mr N Dainton
A194	X4	Ms J Leburn	A195	X3	Ms A Harper
A196	X5	Mr P Beacall	A197	X4	Ms M McNaughton
A198	X4	Mr G McPherson	A199	X5	Mr S Meloche
A200	X3	Mr C Pringle	A201	X3	Mr A De Winton
A202	X3	Mr B Wylie	A203	X3	Mr G Robb
A204	X4	Ms R Watson	A205	X3	Mr S Thompson
A206	X4	Mr G Bewick	A208	X2	Mr K Dickinson
A209	X4	Ms A Smith	A210	X1	Mr P Catanach
A211	X4	Mrs A Hutton	A212	X5	Mr P Dixon
A213	X3	Ms R Barnes	A214	X2	Mr J Sutherland
A215	X4	Mr P McLance	A216	X3	Mr K Macdonald
A219	X4	Mr I Thomson	A220	X2	Mr R White
A221	X4	Mrs B Hardy	A222	X3	Mr D Morgan
A223	X1	Mr A Brown	A224	X4	Ms S Jackson
A225	X1	Mr C Irvine	A226	X1	Mrs F Mcintosh
A227	X4	Mr J Christie	A228	X4	Mr W Hardy
A229	X4	Mr M Jones	A230	X4	Mr M Bloomfield
A231	X3	Mrs S Ross	A232	X3	Mr C Chamberlain
A233	X3	Mr D Walker	A234	X5	Ms J Payne
A235	X4	Mr R Jowett	A236	X1	Mr K Begg
A237	X4	Mr L Phyn	A238	X3	Mr L Munro
A239	X3	Ms J Jackson	A240	X5	Ms A Price
A241	X4	Mr D Gill	A242	X5	Mr S Davis
A243	X2	Mr P Thomas Smith	A244	X5	Mr K Fletcher
A245	X3	Ms L McCafferty	A246	X1	Mr G Nisbet
A247	X1	Mr E Findlay	A248	X4	Mr R Murdoch
A249	X4	Mr A Farquharson	A250	X4	Mr Ken Wright
A251	X3	Mr Dansfield	A252	X5	Mr G Strange
A253	X4	Mr L Duncan	A254	X4	Mr J Mason
A255	X4	Mr C Dobb	A256	X5	Mr D Shiach
A257	X1	Mr M Atherton	A258	X4	Mr A Davidson
A259	X4	Mrs M Bullough	A260	X1	Mrs G Cornroot
A261	X4	Mr I Campbell	A262	X4	Dr J Caldwell

A263	X4	Mr D Menzies	A264	X3	Mr P Mackesy
A265	X5	Mrs H Scott	A266	X3	Mrs M McLeod
A267	X4	Mr A Kostulin	A268	X3	Dr I Ellis
A269	X5	Miss M Watson	A270	X3	Mr A Barbour
A271	X5	Ms S Scott	A272	X1	Mr S Parkinson
A273	X5	Mr J Suttie	A274	X5	Dr D Scott
A275	X4	Mr G Paterson	A276	X4	Miss M Findlay
A277	X1	Mrs A Dew	A278	X4	Mrs L McLeod
A279	X5	Dr C Levitt	A280	X4	Mr W Strachan
A281	X1	Mr H Stubbs	A282	X4	Mrs F Kuperus
A283	X4	Ms M Welsh	A284	X5	Mr D Cummins
A285	X4	Mr C Ramsey	A286	X5	Mr W Patrick
A287	X5	Mr T Bryan	A288	X5	Dr S Blake
A289	X4	Ms M McLeod	A290	X3	Dr R Simmons
A291	X4	Mr G Lowden	A292	X4	Mr K Tarbet
A293	X4	Ms J Saunders	A294	X4	Mr J Pirie
A295	X4	Mr J Mackenzie	A296	X2	Mrs E Purvis
A297	X4	Ms K Dawes	A298	X4	Mr P Dawes
A299	X1	Mr D Godlington	A300	X3	Mrs E Stephens
A301	X2	Mr C Black	A302	X2	Mr M Kerswell
A303	X2	Mrs P Mounter	A304	X1	Mr S Coomes
A305	X4	Mr K Mair	A306	X1	Mr W Gallacher
A307	X4	Ms D Hubbert	A308	X4	Mr S Hubbert
A309	X4	Mrs E Hubbert	A310	X1	Mr P Raistrick
A311	X1	Mr J Cornfoot	A312	X5	Mr R Dalitz
A313	X1	Mrs M Coleman	A314	X3	Mr W Forsyth
A315	X5	Mr I Maclachlan	A316	X3	Mr G Borthwick
A317	X3	Mr D Vardy	A318	X5	Mr J Dealing
A319	X1	Mr D Young	A320	X5	Mr J Thrower
A321	X4	Mr D Massey	A322	X3	Mrs R Walker
A323	X4	Ms E Leighton	A324	X4	Mr R Ross
A325	X4	Mr G Dinnie	A326	X4	Mr H Vetch
A327	X5	Mr A Macdonald	A328	X5	Mr J Savage
A329	X1	Dr A Richardson	A330	X1	Mrs M Richardson
A331	X5	Dr R Corner	A332	X5	Dr J Batt
A333	X5	Mr A Scarfe	A334	X4	Mr G Cruickshank
A335	X5	Mrs M Pirie	A336	X5	Mr I Stevenson
A337	X5	Mr P Thompson	A338	X1	Mrs B Pentland
A339	X1	Mr G Sharman	A340	X5	Dr T Macleod
A341	X5	Mr D Mayo	A342	X5	Dr I Macadam
A343	X4	Mr F Te Bor	A344	X5	Mr R Elder
A345	X5	Mr H Spencer	A346	X3	Mr P Stevenson
A347	X3	Mr A Skinner	A347	X5	Mr D Craig
A348	X5	MR I Smith	A349	X4	Mr J Garioch
A350	X4	Mr W Sinclair	A351	X5	Mr I Frost
A352	X5	Mr K Stewart	A353	X5	Dr A Showler
A354	X5	Mr H Mather	A355	X5	Mr R Reed
A356	X5	Miss C Clarkson Web	A357	X5	Mr M Hewitt

A358	X5	Mr P Webb	A359	X5	Mr S Westmacox
A360	X5	Mrs L Macaskill	A361	X5	Mr R Archbold
A362	X5	Mr M Ridgway	A363	X5	Mrs M Sheriff
A364	X5	Mr R Bickerstaffe	A365	X5	Mr G Palmer
A366	X5	Mrs P Owen	A367	X4	Mr A Fraser
A368	X4	Mr R Hunter	A369	X4	Mr J McCurdy
A370	X5	Mr A Macdonald	A371	X5	Mrs E Deregowska
A372	X5	Dr A Hester	A373	X5	Mr L Hemsley
A374	X5	Mr P Gribbon	A375	X5	Mr C McLean
A376	X5	Mrs M Duncan	A377	X5	Dr D Gordon
A378	X4	Mr P Newman	A379	X4	Mr L Abbott
A380	X5	Mr P Fraser	A381	X5	Mr P Hughes Buchanan
A382	X5	Mr P Webster	A383	X5	Mr M Phillips
A384	X5	Dr I Hunter	A385	X5	Mr A Thompson
A386	X5	Mr P Ferguson	A387	X4	Mr J Goldsworthy
A388	X4	Mr J Jarvie	A389	X5	Mr G Cantley
A390	X5	Mr S Dean	A391	X5	Mr A Carrie
A392	X5	Mr R Crickmore	A393	X5	Dr P Harper
A394	X5	Miss G Morris	A395	X4	Mrs E Collins
A396	X5	Mrs H Marshall	A397	X5	Mr D Ellis
A398	X5	Mr A Gillham	A399	X5	Mr R Carlaw
A400	X4	Mr P Russell	A401	X5	Mr P Sherrine
A402	X4	Ms R Tilling	A403	X5	Mrs L Ogilvie
A404	X5	Mr F Howie	A407	X1	Mr A Nisbet
A408	X5	Mr P Dickson	A409	X5	Mr M Baker Schommer
A410	X2	Mrs L MacDonald	A411	X5	Mr J Philipson
A412	X5	Mr W McLaren	A413	X5	Miss I Addie
A414	X5	Mr B Heath	A415	X5	Mr R Dargie
A416	X4	Rev J Scott	A417	X4	Mr P Moffatt
A418	X4	Mrs J Belford	A419	X5	Mr G Wall
A420	X5	Mr P Ashby	A421	x5	Mr R Govan
A422	X5	Mr J Beesley	A423	X1	Mr R Burn
A424	X5	Mr P Kingston	A425	X5	Mr H Devonshire
A426	X5	Mr S Muir	A427	X5	Mrs A Wendt
A428	X5	Ms N Ross	A429	X5	Mr E Newey
A430	X5	Miss N Ross	A431	X4	Ms J Cooper
A432	X4	Dr G Cooper	A433	X4	Mr D McGinn
A435	X1	Mr J Cornfoot	A438	X5	Mr I Robertson
A441	X4	Mr F Parker	A444	X3	Mr Neil Allan
A445	X5	Mr A Macintosh	A446	X5	Mr K Henry
A447	X5	Mr F Hamilton	A448	X5	Mr I Dougall
A449	X4	Mr F Pullen	A450	X4	Mrs J Robb
A451	Z	Ms Jennings	A452	X5	Mrs M Silver
A453	X1	Mrs CH Montgomery	A454	X1	Mr D Aspinall
A455	X4	Mr Millar	A456	X5	Mrs A Andrews
A457	X5	Mrs M Bryden	A458	X5	Mr J Cairns
A505	X5	Mr R Craig	A406	X5	Mr P Beck

A434	X1	Mr G Adams		A436	X1	Lady K Grant
A439	X5	Mrs A Ramsey		A442	X4	Ms N Hunter
A443	X5	Mr J Kirke		A44O	X5	Mr S Cooke

Total: 446

**Individual companies and businesses**

C65	X3	Mr J Kerr		C69	X1	Mr D Knight
-----	----	-----------	--	-----	----	-------------

Total: 2

**Research/academic organisations/individual academics**

M218	X5	Dr R Lambert				
------	----	--------------	--	--	--	--

Total:1

**Others/Unknown**

P73	Z	Anon		P97	Z	Anon
P122	Z	Anon				

Total: 3

**Table 3-2: Responses using the summary leaflet response forms listed by response category and geographic origin**

	<b>No. of Responses</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>By type of respondent</b>	<b><u>452</u></b>	<b><u>100%</u></b>
Individuals/individual households	446	99
Individual landowners/managers/factors	-	-
Individual companies and businesses	2	<1
Community Councils and associations	-	-
Local Authorities (e.g. Perth and Kinross Council)	-	-
MSPs/MPs/ Local Authority Councillors	-	-
National agencies (e.g. Scottish Environment Protection Agency)	-	-
Regional/Local public agencies (e.g. North of Scotland Water Authority)	-	-
Land Management groups (e.g. National Farmers' Union of Scotland)	-	-
Natural/Cultural Heritage Groups (e.g. RSPB, Gaelic groups)	-	-
Recreation and sport interest groups (e.g. Scottish Canoe Association)	-	-
Social and economic groups (e.g. Cairngorms Chamber of Commerce)	-	-
Professional bodies (e.g. Professional bodies (e.g. Royal Town Planning Institute)	-	-
Research/academic organisations/individual academics (e.g. The Macaulay Institute)	1	<1
Others	3	<1

	<b>No. of Responses</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>By Geographic Origin of Response</b>	<b><u>452</u></b>	<b><u>100%</u></b>
<b><u>Within the Park area</u></b>	<b><u>196</u></b>	<b><u>43</u></b>
Individuals within Option A	83	18
Individuals within Option B, outside A	39	9
Individuals within Option C, outside A and B	72	16
Organisations, overlapping with or within Option C (e.g. Aberdeenshire Council)	2	<1
<b><u>Adjacent areas</u></b>	<b><u>131</u></b>	<b><u>29</u></b>
Individuals outside Option C but within the 5 Local authority areas	131	29
<b><u>Others outwith Park area</u></b>	<b><u>120</u></b>	<b><u>27</u></b>
Individuals outside the 5 local authority areas but within Scotland	90	20
National Organisations (e.g. STB/visitscotland)	0	
Other organisations, not within or overlapping with Option C (e.g. Cabrach and Mortlach Community Association)	0	
Organisations and individuals based primarily outside Scotland	30	7
<b>Unknown</b>	<b><u>5</u></b>	<b><u>1</u></b>



**Table 3-3: Summary of responses about the area of the proposed National Park**

**Preferences expressed for area of the proposed National Park**

	Option A	Option B	Option C	Other
<b>Within the proposed Park Area</b>				
Individuals within Option A	38	18	16	7
Individuals within Option B, outside A	10	15	13	0
Individuals within Option C, outside A and B	19	8	37	6
Other organisations overlapping with or within Option C	1	0	1	0
Subtotal	68	41	67	13
<b>Adjacent Areas</b>				
Individuals outside Option C but with but within the 5 Local Authority areas	37	22	70	3
Subtotal	37	22	70	3
<b>Others outwith Park area</b>				
Individuals outside the 5 local authority areas but within Scotland	8	16	38	3
National Organisations (e.g. STB/visitscotland)	0	0	0	0
Other organisations, not within or overlapping with Option C (e.g. Cabrach and Mortlach Community Association)	0	0	0	0
Organisations and individuals based primarily outside Scotland	5	7	37	2
Unknown	1	0	3	0
Subtotal	14	23	78	5
Total number of responses for each option	119	86	215	21
<b>Total number of responses about the area of the Park</b>	<b>441</b>			

**Table 3-4: Selected quotes about the area of the proposed National Park**

Category of Response	Selected quotations
<p>Preference for Area Option A Total: 119</p>	<p>I believe that A represents the quintessence of the Cairngorm wilderness. I would also be wary of diluting the energy of the staff in the National Park Authority over too wide an area.</p> <p>National Parks being an new development in Scotland, a more restricted area would be advisable and, in any event, the smaller area is essentially the Cairngorms. The larger the area, the greater the problems. What have the Angus Glens or the Monadhliath to do with the Cairngorms?</p> <p>The area option A is the true Cairngorm mountain region - the most spectacular area and probably the most in need of protection from development and where walkers/tourists will need most management.</p> <p>It is bound to be contentious and the less area there is to screw up for the people living there the better. If it's good it can get bigger later.</p> <p>There is a saying that says small is beautiful. Years to come it could maybe expand: but I don't think a Park would be suitable near farmland e.g.. Kirriemuir, Brechin, Edzell, as a holiday maker in Aviemore for 10 years and a keen walker I would like to see all the estates from Ballater, Tomintoul, Aviemore, Newtonmore, Atholl as a Park.</p> <p>I feel that the area should be kept as small as possible to make managing the area as easy as possible for the Authority, and also so that the input on this precious area by the proposed increase in visitors is kept to a minimum e.g. there is some land that is not visited as much.</p>

<p>Preference for Area Option B Total: 86</p>	<p>There is a possible argument for having option B, but restricting extent to north and West to Tomintoul - Corgarff – Ballater. i.e. Park basically covers the 'space on the map', bounded to west by A9 and to east by A93 and A939. Option A is too small, only core mountain area. Option C is possibly too large, too ambitious. Option B includes the whole mountain area between the A9, Braemar, Tomintoul, Aviemore which is the important area.</p> <p>Option B would be good choice as it does include the Forest of Atholl, which too is an area of outstanding beauty. As a matter of fact, the whole of Scotland fits this description, but we have to draw a line somewhere.</p> <p>Covers main core with encircling buffer zone including the features which characterise the Cairngorms - lower Straths, the forests and the open hillside running right up to the high tops. Option C is too big and includes inappropriate areas such as the Monadh Liath, Laggan/Loch Ericht and Deeside commuter towns like Tarland.</p> <p>I agree with the demarcation of the B area. Option C is too unwieldy. One needs a good buffer zone around the core area, which helps to enhance and gives better protection to it.</p>
---	--

Preference for  
Area Option C  
Total: 215

To protect what is left of the forests and encourage much more planting of trees suitable for the countryside. Encourage greater rural activities for the people. Remove planning from Local Authorities and place authority in hands of National Park authority. Whatever power the National Park Authority has it should be spread over as wide an area as possible and that should be the whole of Badenoch and Strathspey.

I would like to see Schiehallion area included.

1. Probably about the right size for our country.
2. As large a size as possible will attract foreigners.
3. More habitats and species will benefit.
4. More people living in the National Park should benefit.
5. For the National Park Authority the largest area possible to maintain sustainable developments and introduce new initiatives.

It is a natural desire to incorporate the maximum though I appreciate that this could cause future difficulty in the liaison workload and financial areas. Consequently, practical considerations may have to outweigh the ideal. I ask this because wherever possible the boundary should be clearly defined by such as a road or river. If any area in option C has to be relinquished I would suggest part of the south west of Dufftown and south of Loch Laggan (or should I write Glen Bogle?).

From my experience in Canada, it is beneficial to communities bordering a National Park to be able to claim that they are 'gateways'. Thus, with option C Brechin, Kirriemuir and Pitlochry could claim to be full service gateways.

Although this is the largest and widest area, we feel that the proposed benefits of making a National Park at the Cairngorms, should be further extended to as much of the surrounding area as is economically and practically possible.

It includes a wider variety of land and its uses. More accessible for both older and younger generations. More items of interest for tourists to visit. Lots of different amenities on offer. Will benefit all those on the main routes, towns and businesses included. Option A - not all will manage to visit it, too small, nothing of much interest i.e. no amenities, places to visit, will not benefit local business.

<p>Preference For Other Areas Total 21</p>	<p>I am not convinced of the real need for a National Park but, if there is to be one it should be as small as possible say option A less area 5 or even area 1 alone. Only sub-area 1 and 3 really meet the requirements for the park to my mind.</p> <p>Option A and parts of B (all the W. and S. sector, Laggan - Drumochter - Blair Atholl - Glen Clova) (and ideally a small part of C - Ben Alder). A covers the essential core. The NE parts of B do not share the same character or international importance. The SW parts of B are vulnerable to government pressure. Ideally Ben Alder (in C) should be included.</p> <p>To restrain inappropriate development throughout the area include in the boundaries the Cairngorms Partnership, and the historically interesting Howe of Cromar.</p>
--	--

**Table 3-5: Summary of responses about planning and other powers of the National Park Authority**

**Do you agree with the proposed arrangements for planning and other powers of the National Park Authority**

	Yes	In part	No	Other
<b>Within the proposed Park Area</b>				
Individuals within Option A	22	32	23	4
Individuals within Option B outside A	24	10	2	0
Individuals within Option C, outside A and B	34	20	12	3
Other organisations overlapping with or within Option C	1	1	0	1
Subtotal	81	63	37	8
<b>Adjacent Areas</b>				
Individuals outside Option C but with but within the 5 Local Authority areas	64	37	19	8
Subtotal	64	37	19	8
<b>Others</b>				
Individuals outside the 5 local authority areas but within Scotland	24	19	24	2
National Organisations (e.g. STB / visitscotland)	0	0	0	0
Other organisations, not within or overlapping with Option C (e.g. Cabrach and Mortlach Community Association)	0	0	0	0
Organisations and individuals based primarily outside Scotland	9	14	28	0
Unknown	2	1	1	1
Subtotal	35	34	53	3
Total number of responses for each option	180	134	109	19
<b>Total number of responses about powers and functions</b>	<b>442</b>			

**Table 3-6: Selected quotes about the proposed arrangements for planning and other powers of the National Park Authority**

Category of Response	Selected quotations
<p>Respondents agreeing with Ministers' proposal for the planning function Total: 180</p>	<p>Will the NPA National Park Authority have any executive authority to, for example, prevent an incompatible activity in the park (e.g. one which is deemed harmful to the environment)?</p> <p>The National Park Authority should not have to be involved with minor planning as this would stop the process. They need to check on major developments, particularly in the inner park, though.</p> <p>Conversely, will money grants be within the power of the National Park Authority? Such help may well be required for non-commercial proposals and constituted in the general good. In this vein, I am personally concerned about the 'wear and tear' being suffered by the Cairngorm plateau up to Ben McDhui - a particularly sensitive area.</p> <p>I agree that planning should be the responsibility of the Local Authorities, however full considerations with the Park Authority should be sought. The Park Authority should have the power to veto inappropriate development within it's area. i.e. unsightly agricultural developments or industrial parks or housing.</p> <p>The Park Authority should be excluded from having planning powers within the park. The Park Authority is not a democratic institution. Powers should remain with the local authority which is.</p> <p>It is good that a national body oversees planning etc. so that individual Local Authorities can be monitored in order that the countryside is maintained.</p> <p>The Authority should have power to prevent commercial developments which would damage yet further the grandeur and importance of wild area.</p>

Only agree in part  
Total: 134

Local Authority should retain planning function in consultation with the NPA National Park Authority. It would be a mistake to cede planning function to an inappropriately representative body.

Planning to be a joint process between Park Authority and Local Authority based on clearly defined guidelines - a 'park plan' as a 'local plan'. (Too many non elected members on the Park Authority could lead to a lack of local accountability if the park were responsible for planning. Equals the Local Authorities record for consultation or conforming to a local plan is not good.)

Guidelines could be given to Local Authorities for 'outer A zone, B zone and C zone'. Badenoch and Strathspey should be proud of scenery, history and heritage, but it should also be a thriving and developing place - not just a museum!

The National Park Authority should itself to be directly responsible for planning within the park.

We do not agree that the National Park Authority should solely be directly responsible for planning within the park, we think that Local Authorities and existing organisations should be responsible for planning and functioning within the park but should consult; the National Park Authority on decisions and preparations of developments.

Park Authority to have greater powers over planning than the suggested consultation by Local Authorities. Local Authorities record on this issue (e.g. Housing out with designated areas) is not particularly satisfactory.

A lot more details would be required! How will Scottish Ministers 'meet all the costs of the Park Authority'? Where will the money come from?

Possibly better if the Park Authority is responsible for planning provided they consult, and give hard consideration to Local Authority views. Just in case Local Authorities take a hard line and enforce their view.

Park Authority should have full control of all planning matters in the park. To control the present and future development of the park and ensure suitable protection of the environment.

I suggest that the National Park Authority should have absolutely nothing to do with (normal, private, domestic) planning applications as I feel that local residents will be restricted unfairly if the National Park Authority places too many restrictions on above. The local council should only involve National Park Authority in major developments such as the Aviemore centre or new industrial estates etc. e.g. I feel that if the National Park Authority is involved with planning, people wouldn't be able to put a garden fence up without a load of forms to fill etc.

Overall control should rest with the Park Authority, not be passed down to the Local Authorities. This works in English National Parks and prevents vested interests from taking control.

Planning powers should go to the National Park Authority, not remain with the Local Authorities.

1. The Park Authority would have a better overview of the needs of the park as a whole.
2. The park's aims cannot be met if planning issues are not under its control.



<p>Disagree with Ministers proposal for planning powers to remain with Local Authorities Total: 109</p>	<p>This is just another layer of expensive bureaucracy foisted in on our general community.</p> <p>Planning powers should be invested in the Park Authority. This will ensure consistent planning decisions across the whole area of the park in harmony with policies of the NP authority as stated in the National Park plan. The official proposal means planning by 4 or 5 authorities according to their own priorities and an ineffective NP board.</p> <p>Higher proportion of native born business people still operating, not necessarily councillors or self-appointed bodies with personal interests.</p> <p>I believe that all planning must be the direct responsibility of a powerful National Park Authority. One planning authority will result in uniform, consistent standards across all area of the proposed National Park.</p> <p>Planning must be in the hands of the National Park Authority; local communities too constrained through lack for wider experience elsewhere. Drumnadroch and Aviemore are prime examples of local committees inability to control and foresee the dangers of being compliant to business interests.</p> <p>The only workable option, as proven in England, is for the Park Authority to be responsible for planning. Planning for sustainable economic development which preserves the quality of the park can only be done by a simple organisation (the park authority). It makes no sense to split planning between 3 or more Local Authorities.</p> <p>To achieve a proper administration the National Park Authority requires planning powers. Local Authorities have too many other responsibilities to allow them to give to the park area the priority required by its uniqueness.</p> <p>If there is to be a national park, of which I am not convinced, then it should be set up primarily for conservation reasons. Recreation, economic and social development should all be kept to a minimum. At all times the main aim and purpose should be conservation.</p> <p>The planning powers should be given to the National Park Authority. If planning powers were to remain with Local Authorities there could and no doubt would be a conflict of interests.</p> <p>Full planning powers should be fully vested with the new national park authority, not existing Local Authorities. Over the years, a fragmented planning approach has resulted in a damaged landscape/environment. What's the point in perpetuating this situation? This is a chance to create a uniform planning policy.</p>
---	---

<p>Some other comment Total 19</p>	<p>From observation in Canada &amp; England, differences in opinion can be expected over:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Use e.g. mountain bikes vs. walkers, four wheel drives vs. horses.</li><li>2. Construction standards for fences, styles, gates.</li><li>3. Location of signs and promotional facilities.</li></ol> <p>These topics are best raised before the designation order is made.</p> <p>I think there is a danger in making only one body the Authority for planning in that a monopoly on ideas and development may be detrimental. Whilst there are two then there is a measure of tempering unacceptable ideas, and decisions will be more democratically arrived at. We need to ensure that the Park benefits rather than any other vested interest.</p> <p>Full planning control should be vested in the National Park Authority. To avoid more examples of damage through decisions made by Local Authorities.</p>
--	---

**Table 3-7: Summary of responses about membership of the National Park Authority**

<b>Agreement with proposed membership of the governing Board of the National Park Authority</b>	Yes	In part	No	Other
<b>Within the proposed Park Area</b>				
Individuals within Option A	24	37	19	2
Individuals within Option B outside A	14	14	5	2
Individuals within Option C outside A and B	27	22	17	0
Other organisations overlapping with or within Option C	1	1	1	0
Subtotal	66	74	42	4
<b>Adjacent Areas</b>				
Individuals outside Option C but with but within the 5 LA areas	47	47	25	7
Subtotal	47	47	25	7
<b>Others</b>				
Individuals outside the 5 local authority areas	26	29	9	3
National Organisations	0	0	0	0
Other organisations not overlapping with Option C	0	0	0	0
Organisations and individuals based primarily outside Scotland	18	26	6	1
Unknown	2	1	1	0
Subtotal	46	56	16	4
Sub Totals for each response	159	177	83	15
<b>Total number of responses about membership of the Park Board</b>	<b>434</b>			

**Table 3-8: Selected quotes about the membership of the national Park Authority**

Category of Response	Selected quotations
<p>Support for Ministers' proposal:                      5 directly elected members;                      10 LA nominated members; and 10 members directly appointed by Scottish Ministers</p> <p>Total 159</p>	<p>The allocation of members should be based on a combination of populations and area within each local authority.</p> <p>The Local Authorities and government should specify what each member's knowledge and experience is. I agree with the balance between directly elected and appointed, provided proper emphasis is placed on those nominated and appointed having relevant knowledge and experience.</p> <p>Membership should reflect stakeholders interests including farming, environmental, conservation, recreation.</p> <p>It is important and imperative that those with the taste of the ultimate running of the National Park know their job and, the less interference from 'Ministers', the better are the running, maintenance and husbandry of the park, to those who recognise its beauty, importance and its worth.</p> <p>I think that the success of the park will depend wholly in the quality of the members of the Authority and therefore it should have a high number of scientists - qualified biologists, zoologists, conservationists, land management specialists etc. Perhaps scientists from the University of Aberdeen could be included. The five elected members should also be people with specialist knowledge.</p> <p>The Minister appointing members should choose at least 5 with extensive experience of National Parks internationally including England and Wales. The requirement of the legislation has - 'all members nominated by Local Authorities and appointed by Ministers must have knowledge and experience relevant to the functions of the National Park' is absolutely vital to the achievement of the aims of the NP.</p>

<p>Agree in part Total 177</p>	<p>All 25 members should stand for election and should live in the area. To swamp locally elected members with twenty nominees is just another 'quango' fed by 'quangos'.</p> <p>Too many members - no agreements. 25 members - fairly democratic. Its not the size that matters, but quality of interest in proposals. A National Park will only be a National Park if the very purpose of preservation of the wilds is paramount: hence too many economic and diverse issues which conflict will stifle the process. Nature cannot wait until we all agree. Compromise is important and no-one/no body can look after the Cairngorms better than the Cairngorms themselves!</p> <p>10 local elected members, 10 local authority members and 5 external members with suitable experience. Not clear where the balance of 10 members out with 5 local and 10 Local Authority suggested are to come from.</p> <p>That membership be limited to a maximum of 20 and made up thus: directly elected locals - 10, local authority nominations - 5, appointments by Scottish Minister - 5. Endeavour to limit politicisation of view and overall action or re-action in a body, whose main aim must surely be conservation.</p> <p>More than 20% of Board to be elected from local community - say 40%? Locals living in the area of park are directly affected by decisions made by Park Board - affecting their lives and businesses.</p> <p>The membership should be 50% appointed by Government and 50% local members. Each local member coming from a specific area within the park, similar to local Councils. A balance will be struck allowing the people who live in the area to have a constructive say in the runnings of the park, otherwise the impression will be that things are imposed by government.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the local Councils choice should not be simply local councillors.</li> <li>2. That any local councillors nominated to be on the Nat. Park Authority should NOT belong to any other statutory body which might have an interest in the NP e.g. SNH, for there could be possible conflict of interest.</li> <li>3. That those chosen to be a member of the NP Authority should have wide experience and positive vision: fossilised thinking is in no-one's interest.</li> <li>4. That the five 'elected' members should not be local councillors.</li> </ol> <p>Membership of the Board needs to ensure adequate local representation - people from areas outside of the park may be unaware of present issues. Total number of 25 is plenty - need a fair proportion of views, but too many cause delays.</p>
------------------------------------	--

Option: No.  
disagree with  
proposed  
membership of  
Park board  
Total 83

20% elected members is far too small 50/50 is more realistic .

There should be 13 Scottish Executive/Local Authority nominees and 12 community group representatives. The Scottish executive is supposed to be committed to devolved management of local rural areas and to have more and more community representation. The above would solve the imbalance of the preferred solution showing a top heavy establishment structure. There are groups within the proposed park area other than community councils who play an important part in community economic development locally - for example Ballater (RDW) and Braemar Tourism Group.

There are too few 'local' people and too many otherwise elected persons. Outside influence is just that and it appears to already be getting away from local control. Should be a larger proportion of locally elected members.

18 members only - 6 elected by Scottish Ministers, 6 elected by Local Authorities, 6 elected by those living in the area. 25 members is too large. We are 'fed up' with 'Quangos'. Those in authority should not ever forget that those who were born and brought up in the proposed area know far more about it and its environment than most politicians, (both local and national). They have to live here and have paid for the errors of too many past years.

Locally elected representatives to be 10 in number. Reps. nominated by Councils to be 8 in number. Scottish Executive Reps. To be 7 in number. To provide a 'real' local democratic representation. The 10 locals to be divided into groups - e.g. 5 Com. Councils, 2 landowners, 2 farmers, 1 environmental.

Smaller number - more directly elected ( no vested interests). Local Authority and Government direct appointments remain equal but fewer. Maximum 6, 6 and 6. Quangos always too large; reduce cost of decisions by consulting interested organisations and taking scientific advice. Smaller number can do this.

Cost, 15-16 should be ample. A National Park sounds very grand and may possibly attract tourism, which is good for business. However, a boost in tourists could well have the undesirable effect of destroying that which it is hoped to preserve, i.e., flora, fauna and the general tranquillity and remoteness of the area.

20 elected local (park resident) members, 5 members appointed by Scottish Executive. It is the livelihood and residence of park residents. They should determine its operation and evolution.

The number of members should depend on which option is pursued. If option A too many people - and if C probably about correct. Members elected by Scottish Ministers is - at 80% far too high. A much higher % should be elected by people living in the area.

I do not want to see a perpetuation of involvement of the former planning authorities. A fresh approach is needed to the management of an area of natural beauty. This will make it new and special, and avoid references to previous entrenched Local Authority positions.

The proposal on membership is not clear but it seems to indicate that local authority representation would be too strong. The national Park Authority must have strong representation from wider interests and expertise i.e. Include, say, 5 to 10 non-local authority representatives (out of the total of 25). Whole park decisions (as I have outlined them under). Might be hampered if too many authority members represent local areas. It is vital that people with wider expertise of national park issues and management serve on the authority so that planning and other decisions are taken in the best possible interest of the whole Nat. Park. These experts must have more than an advisory function, they must be involved in the decision making process. Much funding for the Nat. Park will come from government sources i.e. from tax payers in the whole of the UK. It is therefore

Option not selected	Why are the 25 not all elected locally. 25 members, 5 locally elected, 20 foisted on us by the Scottish Office. Who pays their wages.
Comments Made	The directly elected people should live within the park area not in and around as proposed. The local authority nominations should be from a population within the park system. This would give as good a local representation on the board as we are likely to achieve.
Total 15	<p>Don't know enough about running a National Park to know how many people are needed!</p> <p>Membership should reflect population not area and include some representation of population on the margins of the park.</p> <p>The five directly elected members should actually live within the park area - not just around. From my experience in Canada, those living within the park boundaries particularly farmers, have a justifiably different point of view from those outside and they should feel well represented.</p> <p>Idea 1 - Local Authorities have all powers. However a restricted National Park Authority is needed to discuss and approve - up to 5 members is enough.</p> <p>Idea 2 - National Park Authority is made of people from Local Authorities - National Park Authority size is equal to the number of Local Authorities' representatives, (1 for each authority).</p> <p>In either case, it is essential that members of the National Park Authority be aware of each area/region and their needs as well as of the running and management of a National Park. The National Park Authority could have members that provide extra knowledge such as legal expertise, fund raising expertise, budget and management expertise which might not be found otherwise. There is no reason to require previous experience as the area would not benefit more from local trained (adequate) people than of someone not living in the area who would be an expert in running National Parks - it does not mean the second person has to be disqualified but a balance must be reached in order to prepare each areas integrity within the whole of the nation.</p> <p>Again leave this part to the experts.</p> <p>No particular comment. General distrust of too many political appointees.</p> <p>Majority of members to have interest in and experience in the various aspects of wildlife and conservation and outdoor activities. All posts to be advertised and candidates interviewed.</p> <p>How far are party politics likely to enter into nomination and/or election? Who pays election expenses, prepares 'campaign' literature? How long will members of the governing board be expected to serve for? How much time must they give to the park's decisions? How a suitable mix of skills be ensured and of social background, knowledge and experience, relevant to the functions of a National Park, brings many questions.</p> <p>As for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs NP but equal representation for each of the Local Authorities included in the park and not based on population density.</p> <p>25 members - as many as possible from conservation/outdoor recreation background. National park are firstly for conservation, secondly for appropriate substantial recreational use and thirdly for appropriate economic use to benefit local communities.</p>

**Table 3-9: Summary of responses related to other issues**

Other comments on the Proposed National Park					
	Name of the National Park	The Consultation Process	Comments on Costs	Future management of the National Park	Miscellaneous
<b>Within the proposed Park Area</b>					
Individuals within Option A	5	3	3	16	0
Individuals within Option B, outside A	0	0	0	4	1
Individuals within Option C outside A and B	6	1	1	10	1
Other organisations overlapping with or within Option C	0		0	1	0
subtotal	11	4	4	31	2
<b>Adjacent Areas</b>					
Individuals outside Option C but of within the five LA areas	12	5	3	11	2
subtotal	12	5	3	12	2
<b>Others</b>					
Individuals outside the five local authority areas	8	1	0	12	2
National Organisations	0		0	0	0
Other organisations, not within or overlapping with Option C (e.g. Cabrach and Mortlach Community Association)	0		0	1	0
Organisations and individuals based primarily outside Scotland	0	3	0	9	3
Unknown	0		0		0
Totals for each response	8	4	0	22	5
Total number of responses for each option	31	13	7	64	9
<b>Total number of other responses recorded</b>	<b>124</b>				





**Table 3-10 Selected quotes related to other issues**

Category of Response	Selected Quotations
<p>Name of the National Park Total 31</p>	<p>Retain the name Cairngorms National Park.</p> <p>Area C if chosen would be better named 'Grampian National Park' or Grampians National Park'.</p> <p>Cairngorms National Park is rather cumbersome. My Oxford dictionary gives one meaning of park as 'large tract of land kept in natural state for public benefit'. Any tract = region...of indefinite (usually large) extent. Why not just Cairngorms Park – preferably with a logo. (see diagram on summary) Scots Pine, upper pole in orange, rounded hills and a corrie in purple, 2-3 red deer, some 'royals'.</p> <p>Name: Cairngorm National Park would be misleading if either of options B or C were to be chosen. As to an alternative? Something on the lines of 'Grampian &amp; Cairngorm' National Park would perhaps be more accurate?</p> <p>The name Cairngorms National Park should only apply if area A is chosen.</p>
<p>Comments on the consultation exercise Total 13</p>	<p>The current proposal seems well organised and appropriate. What a wonderful idea to have a Cairngorms National Park.</p> <p>Try to get local people involved - not easy I know but you may have to go out and 'evangelise' them - they won't come in on their own – people are 'busy'.</p> <p>I was very interested in my afternoon visit in Aberlour 29/03/01 and was very well informed by the gentleman on duty.</p>
<p>Comments on Costs Total 7</p>	<p>The whole exercise will fail unless it is properly funded.</p> <p>Park must be financed by Government both at commencement and during existence. No burden must fall on regional or local finances. Park should, where possible be self financing, except for roads, water sewerage and advertising.</p>

<p>Comments on the future management of the National Park Total 64</p>	<p>Part of remit should be to encourage small businesses in area.</p> <p>I think the National Park is a good idea and hope to see it introduced as soon as possible. However I am concerned that it will be driven by people who have no links with the area, and I do not wish to see the local population being steam rolled. People who were born and bred here have cultural links with the area and most of them generally care for and protect it, I hope the local population is cared for by the National Park, for example, in land use and affordable housing.</p> <p>There should exist a mutual respect for the residents, farmers, holiday makers and visitors to the area by enforcement of rules for dog owners, walkers, cyclists, climbers, etc.</p> <p>I am against a National Park and am quite happy that the area is largely in private hands, but believe there should be very strict controls on land management (in the massif) and carefully planned controlled development of the urban sprawl which is Aviemore, Kincaig, L. Morlich and Braemar areas; skiing area curtailed, but sensible recreation for those who love dangerous, wild and lovely places.</p> <p>It is absolutely unacceptable that the park be run from the Central Belt. Promoting sustainable economic and social development of the local communities should be at the top of the list of objectives, not the bottom.</p> <p>The importance of this grand inheritance cannot be over-estimated. The number of voices raised in its support are few in comparison to that of 'developers' and 'entrepreneurs' and this must be addressed before the chances of conservation are lost forever.</p> <p>If the NP is to have real meaning and work effectively, a much greater emphasis must be put onto protection of the environment, than recent appalling decisions have allowed.</p> <p>The Cairngorms are an area of outstanding wildlife and this is delicately balanced. Every effort is needed to see that it is there for future generations to appreciate, and there is the need for this to over-ride short term gain in enjoyment.</p> <p>The Cairngorms is probably the most important natural area of land in Britain. The National Park debate is a great opportunity to change the status quo and give the protection this area deserves.</p>
--	--

Miscellaneous Comments i.e. Funicular Total 9	In my opinion the funicular should NEVER have been allowed to go ahead especially as walkers (mature like me!) will lose facility of uplift before setting off on big mountain day. Too expensive and will cost farmers too much, ugly scars, etc.  It's a great place - hopefully apart from the funicular the rest can stay wild and peaceful.
--	--