

Section 4: The consultation exercise in the local area

This section of the report summarises the information we received from the consultation exercise in and around the Cairngorms Partnership area. We aimed to involve all the communities in the area and to work with existing groups. We received much advice and assistance from the Cairngorms Partnership Community Councils Group who produced and circulated a manifesto to clarify what the community representatives in the area expect from the National Park. Its full text can be found at Annex A.

In order to involve all the communities in the area we asked each community to choose how they wished to be consulted, either by managing the consultation exercise in their areas themselves or by holding a special meeting with an independent facilitator. We also ran a series of special events around the edge of the proposed National Park to involve adjacent communities. The process was co-ordinated by a small steering group involving staff from SNH and the Cairngorms Partnership, the convenor of the Community Councils Group and the independent facilitators contracted by SNH.

The Community-led consultation

We were pleased that 20 Community Councils and associations chose to manage the consultation in their areas, nominating local facilitators who, in many cases, were community councillors. SNH provided expenses for the local facilitators, and contracted independent professional facilitators to provide training and support. A key objective was to provide the opportunity to build the capacity of communities to become more involved in this debate, while still meeting the requirements of the consultation.

Twenty Community Councils and associations led their own consultation exercises, involving twenty-five facilitators as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4-1: Communities involved in the community-led consultation exercise

Community Council or Association	Facilitator(s)
Ballogie and Birse Community Council	Freida Morrison John Addy
Blair Atholl and Struan Community Council	Innes Smith Julie Gardiner
Carr Bridge and Vicinity Community Council	Kate Adamson
Cromdale and Advie Community Council	Wendy Alexander Miriam Clift
Dalnain Bridge and Vicinity Community Council	Mary McCafferty
Finzean Community Council	John Forster Kate Farquharson
Kincraig and Vicinity Community Council	Nic Bullivant
Aviemore and Vicinity Community Council	Ian Malcolm
Ballater and Crathie Community Council	Peter Dawes
Boat of Garten and Vicinity Community Council	Laurie Wedderburn Kate Adamson
Braemar Community Council	Peter Dawes

Grantown and Vicinity Community Council	Francesca Scott
Killiecrankie and Fincastle Community Council	Alex Cruikshank
Kingussie and Vicinity Community Council	Bernie Jones
Kirkmichael and Tomintoul Community Association	Sheila Thompson
Kirriemuir Community Council	Claire Broadhurst Helen Humphries
Laggan Community Association	Judy Carey Lucy Grant
Mid-Deeside Community Council	Drennan Watson
Nethy Bridge and Vicinity Community Council	Shirley Bateman
Rothiemurchus and Glenmore Community Association	Laurie Wedderburn Mary Ferguson

A variety of methods were used in each community as shown in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2: Methods used during the community led consultation

Community	Number of participants	Examples of methods used
Aviemore	85	Questionnaire survey Awareness raising event - Tesco supermarket Meeting with Rotary Club Drop-in event Open meeting
Ballater and Crathie	44	Meeting with Probus Club Drop-in event Open meeting Contact with individual landowners
Ballogie and Birse	48	Telephone survey Individual meetings with farmers and businesses Open meeting
Blair Atholl and Struan	74	Meeting for game-keepers and shepherds 4 open meetings across area
Boat of Garten	88 adults 73 children	Primary School meeting 8 'coffee party' meetings Meeting with WRI Open meeting
Braemar	76	Drop-in event Open evening workshop
Carr Bridge	97	Meeting with Craft Group 5 neighbourhood focus groups Meeting with Tourist Association and Community Council Individual discussions Open meeting
Cromdale and Advie	118	Meetings with Badminton Club, WRI Pensioners' Lunch Club Bowls Club After Church Meeting Interviews with local businesses Questionnaire survey and open meeting

Dulnain Bridge	62	Meeting with WRI Meeting with Over 50 Club; Business Community meeting Questionnaire survey Open meeting
Finzean	114	Meetings with Community Association, WRI, PTA Church Elders Meeting with Under Fives Group Open meeting
Grantown	130	3 meetings with existing groups Drop-in event Questionnaire survey Business interest meeting Tourist interest meeting Open meeting
Killiecrankie and Fincastle	50	Questionnaire survey
Kincraig	70	Meetings with employers 9 community meetings Open meeting Questionnaire survey
Kingussie	No data collected	Questionnaire survey 2 Drop-in days 3 open meetings
Kirkmichael and Tomintoul	11	Display in library Community Association meeting 2 open meetings
Kirriemuir	155	Community Council meeting Meeting with young people and community education groups Meeting with Women's Research Group and Women's Group Drop-in event Open meeting
Laggan	50	5 targeted special interest meetings Questionnaire
Mid-Deeside	65	2 awareness meetings Exhibition 2 open meetings
Nethy Bridge	200	2 drop-in events Questionnaire survey Open meeting
Rothiemurchus and Glenmore	43	3 community meetings

Each of the communities were required to produce a short report in a standard format which summarised the methods used during the consultation exercise and addressed the main messages on each of the key issues from the consultation document. We asked that the relevant Community Council or association endorsed each report. Copies of the full reports from each of the community-led consultation exercises are available for inspection at SNH offices in Aberdeen, Aviemore, near Perth, Edinburgh and at the Cairngorms Partnership offices in Grantown-on-Spey.

The independently facilitated community meetings

A number of community councils and associations chose not to manage their own consultation exercises but opted for an independently-facilitated community meeting organised by SNH (Table 4-3).

Table 4-3: Communities choosing independently facilitated meetings

Community Council or Association	Facilitator	Number of participants
Dalwhinnie	Bob Forsyth	8
Donside	Bob Forsyth	7
Glenlivet and Inveravon	Bob Forsyth	7
Kirriemuir Landward East and Kirriemuir Landward West	Alex Downie	35
Mount Blair	Alex Downie	8
Newtonmore and Vicinity	Alex Downie	32
Pitlochry and Moulin	Bob Forsyth	17
Rannoch and Tummel	Bob Forsyth	11

Inveresk Community Council decided that as the community had been attending nearby meetings, a separate meeting was not required.

Involving communities on the periphery

We sought to involve communities around the edge of the proposed National Park who were not directly involved with the Cairngorms Partnership Community Council Group. A series of one-day, drop-in events and evening meetings were organised as shown in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4: Community events on the periphery of the proposed National Park

Community	Facilitator	Number of participants
Aberlour	Alex Downie	5
Aberfeldy	Bob Forsyth	9
Alford	Bob Forsyth	8
Blairgowrie	Bob Forsyth	16
Mid-Atholl, Strathtay and Grandtully	Bob Forsyth	24
Laurencekirk and Fettercairn	Bob Forsyth	8

In addition the facilitators were asked to assist with preparation of a report of one meeting with Pitlochry Tourist Committee.

Summaries of the views expressed

Communities expressed a variety of views on a number of the issues. Tables 4-5 to 4-7 summarise as far as possible the views expressed in each community. For further information please refer to the original reports from each of the community-led consultation exercises or community meetings.

Table 4-5: Summary of the views expressed in the community-led consultation exercises

Abbreviations used: NPA =National Park Authority LA =Local Authority

Should a National Park be designated?	What area should a National Park cover?	What powers should the Park Authority have?	Membership of the Board of the Park Authority?	Name of the Park and other issues?
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Aviemore Enough designations exist already so is it needed? Concerns expressed about additional bureaucracy.</p>	<p>Preference for Option A with Option C a close second. Boundary should follow natural features.</p>	<p>No or limited powers. Fears about influence of non-local members. Planning should remain with local authorities but within an overall strategy. NPA should be a statutory consultee.</p>	<p>Majority of members should live and work in the Park. Allocation of Local authority members should be based on population. Elections should follow nominations and appointments by Scottish Executive.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park” was favoured name. Many other suggestions too. Funding from central government. No restrictions on access for hill users.</p>
<p>Ballater and Crathie Not answered directly by many. Many comments on Park boundary perhaps infer that they approved of National Park. Only three views opposed.</p>	<p>Option A was most popular with both B and C much less popular. Clear preference for not too large a Park, especially in first instance. General agreement about boundary principles, especially use of watersheds.</p>	<p>Slight majority in favour of Park Authority having full control of planning. Remainder favoured Ministers’ proposed arrangements as described in the consultation document.</p>	<p>Board of 25 members is too big. Slight majority wanted more directly elected members with some suggestions for around 30%. Wide range of other views. Appointed members should not be political appointments. Fears were expressed about excessive bureaucracy. Unanimous view that direct elections should follow appointments</p>	<p>Strong majority view for “Cairngorms National Park”.</p>
<p>Ballogie and Birse Majority in favour of designation. Current mechanisms are too confusing and fragmented. Could have economic benefits but</p>	<p>Overwhelming majority for Option B and inclusion of Ballogie and Birse. Boundary should be determined by natural features.</p>	<p>Park Authority needs ‘clout’. Planning should be consistent, sympathetic to vernacular architecture and accordingly should be the planning authority. Park Authority needs to take an</p>	<p>Should be ten or 15 directly elected members. LA nominees should from wards within the Park. Must always be a majority of local representation. Must be open and transparent method of appointment and appointees.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park”. Must be appropriate funds available to undertake all the tasks related to all the aims.</p>

concerns about more bureaucracy.		holistic and positive approach.	should have local knowledge LA allocation should be by population although concerns were expressed about domination by Speyside representatives.	
Blair Atholl and Struan Majority in favour of designation but concerns were expressed about bureaucracy, too much talk and no action and threat of attracting too many visitors.	Range of views expressed but with perhaps most support for Option B. If too large it would be difficult to manage and may not be resourced. Do not split communities.	Range of views expressed but with most support for planning function with local authorities and Park Authority should as statutory consultee.	Range of views. 25 members seems too large. LA nominations should be by area or by population. Local land based knowledge and international experience are important. More than five directly elected.	Should be "Park Service" not "Park Authority". There must be adequate finance for the Park.
Boat of Garten Little response. General lack of knowledge of the legislative conditions for designation.	Majority preference for small area (including Badenoch and Strathspey) due to easier administration and better representation of local people.	Majority in favour of local authorities retaining the development control function and consult Park Authority on plans. No additional powers, no increase in bureaucracy or restrictive legislation, no competition with local business. Conservation should be the priority in areas of national significance but elsewhere socio-economic development.	Should be five directly elected members locally. LA nominations must be elected councillors and live, work or represent wards within the Park. Elections should be after appointments. More than 50% of the membership must be local. Skills required: business, tourism, marketing, planning, conservation.	"Cairngorms National Park". Finance was a recurring theme – a quality Park means funding. Must be accountable. Uniformity not wanted.
Braemar Majority in favour of	Large majority favour a	All those who commented	Strong call for more directly	Majority favoured

designation but significant opposition too.	smaller Park, close to Option A. Funding should not dictate the size and location of the Park.	favoured the National Park Authority having the planning function. Range of views on other powers.	elected members with some wanting at least 15 with only three LA nominations. Elections should be after appointments. Community Councils have a positive role to play.	“Cairngorm National Park”. Concerns about Braemar lying at the centre of the Park but with only a relatively small voice.
---	--	--	--	---

<p>Carr Bridge Not discussed due to lack of time and knowledge about the legislative conditions.</p>	<p>Whole of Badenoch and Strathspey to be included. General view in favour of smaller Park. Natural features should be used to determine the boundary.</p>	<p>Planning should remain a local authority function both for strategic and development purposes. No competition with local business. Role to market local attractions and local products, information and disabled facilities, recreation, housing (especially for young people), powers to manage visitors to avoid undue pressure on areas, power to establish land management agreements.</p>	<p>Preference for 25 members. LA nominees should be Councillors, their numbers determined on the basis of population. Local knowledge and experience are the most important attributes for Board members. The majority of members should be people who live and work in the Park.</p>	<p>No consensus on a name although some felt 'Highland' should feature. Park must be sufficiently funded. While accepting that a conservation priority is required in some areas, in others economic development should have priority.</p>
<p>Cromdale and Advie There was a consensus that the area was suitable for National Park designation but concerns expressed that designation was being forced upon the area.</p>	<p>Option B is the preferred option. Option B reunites Cromdale and Advie with part of Morayshire which was the historical association. Essential that Cromdale and Advie be included. Approach to area assessment is appropriate.</p>	<p>If additional powers mean more regulation then only limited powers. The Park should make things happen - not block things. New and environmentally friendly farming should be promoted. Planning should stay with the local authority in consultation with the Park Authority on larger issues and developments.</p>	<p>25 members for the Board was felt appropriate. Must be more directly elected local members. LA nomination should be decided on population not area. Must be a mixture of specialist and local expertise and knowledge within the membership. Members should live and work within the Park boundary. Appointments should be made before direct elections.</p>	<p>Majority in favour of "Cairngorms National Park". Must be infrastructure and investment to manage Park effectively and meet expectations.</p>
<p>Dalnain Bridge General area of the Cairngorms is a</p>	<p>Option B with some additional areas was</p>	<p>Planning function should remain with the local</p>	<p>Five directly elected members is too few. Ideally: eight appointed</p>	<p>"Cairngorms National Park". Success is</p>

special place of outstanding beauty with distinctive character and the best means of ensuring it is protected is National Park designation.	overwhelming preference. Proposals to determine the detailed boundary were considered appropriate.	authorities. List of proposed powers is alarming and most should remain with local authorities (e.g. powers of land acquisition). There should be no additional restrictions on rights of access.	by Scottish Executive, eight appointed by local authority and eight elected by local people. Allocation of membership between local authorities should be by population. Direct elections should follow, not precede, appointments and nominations.	critically dependent on sufficient funding and 'new money' not just core funding.
Finzean Large majority in favour of the designation of a National Park in the Cairngorms.	Most support for Option A with Option B next. Too large an area is difficult to manage. Vote marginally in favour of Finzean not being within the Park.	The Park Authority should be the planning authority. Need consistent interpretation and application of planning guidance and regulations and a more visionary and positive approach than at present.	Strong view that there needs to be more (60%+) directly elected local members. They have a better understanding of the needs and aspiration of the areas. The Authority must respond to local needs. Land management and social, economic and community development expertise is required on the Board.	"Cairngorms National Park". Must be true devolution and empowerment of local communities to determine their future.
Grantown-on-Spey Majority view that the area fulfils the criteria. Some doubt whether area encompassed by Option C meets criteria for distinctive character and coherent identity.	Most agree with the size suggested by Option A – provided Grantown is included in this. Others preferred Option B but including Badenoch and Strathspey. Area should be kept small enough for efficient management and avoid spreading	50/50 split amongst those consulted about whether the NPA or the local authorities should be the planning authority. NPA should be at least a statutory consultee. NPA could be planning authority for activities over a nominated sum e.g. £10,000 NPA should be active in an	25 members is fine. Higher ratio of elected members. Allocation of nominated members for LAs should be based on population and should represent wards within the Park. Knowledge and expertise should cover land management, recreation, housing, planning, employment, local culture and common sense.	Majority are happy with "Cairngorms National Park". People want to be included in further consultation – particularly relation to representation on the Board.

	resources too thinly.	integrated promotional role on tourism, education, transport, paths and should provide a consistent ranger service.	Balance between concern for local culture and the environment – with emphasis on local culture. Majority of members should be local - 20 out of 25 or 60% of members. Need to prevent landowners from monopolising local representation.	
Killiecrankie and Fincastle 84% thought that the area is suitable – though this does not mean that they necessarily agree that it should be designated.	53% preferred Option A 36% preferred Option C 7% preferred Option B. Residents would prefer to be in or out of the NP area as a whole. Main reason for not wanting to be in is a lack of affinity with the Cairngorms.	Majority (51%) prefer joint planning between LAs and NPA. 27% prefer planning to remain with the Local Authority. 9% prefer planning to be NPA responsibility. Over 60% agree with the proposals for local planning arrangements – although only 40% agreed with the statement ‘the possibility of establishing a local plan for all the area’.	Majority (44%) felt 25 members is the right size. Knowledge and expertise identified is adequate. 80% of respondents would like to see more than 5 people directly elected. 36% felt that direct elections should precede appointments and nominations by Scottish Ministers, 36% felt they should follow.	71% felt “Cairngorms National Park” is the right name. 38% felt that ‘to promote sustainable economic and social development of the areas communities’ should be the second aim of National Parks to ‘conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area’ as the first of aim.

<p>Kincraig and Vicinity Agreement that general area is special. Conditional agreement about distinctive character and identity. General uncertainty and disagreement that the third criteria is met.</p>	<p>Most support for “Option A plus a bit” (particularly inclusion of Grantown-on-Spey and Laggan).</p>	<p>General support for planning powers to remain with LA but for NPA to be statutory consultee. No clear view on single local plan. Many specific views on powers including support for investment in infrastructure and affordable housing.</p>	<p>General support for 25 members. Agree that Board members should have relevant knowledge and experience and that Board places should not be reserved for specific organisations or interest groups. General desire for more than 50% local representation.</p>	<p>Agreement on “Cairngorms National Park”. Funding should be adequate and should be a national responsibility with no additional burden on locals. Concerns were raised about communities close to but outside of the Park boundary.</p>
<p>Kingussie Majority view that the area is suitable for designation. The area is a place of beauty heritage and tradition appealing to a wide spectrum of visitors.</p>	<p>Majority view that southern boundary should be Dalwhinnie going east to Lochnagar including Ballater, Tomintoul and Grantown, then using the border of the Cairngorms Partnership back to Dalwhinnie. Option A was most popular of the three options.</p>	<p>Planning powers should remain with LA but they should consult NPA. Support for single local plan. Many detailed views on powers, including that the NPA should not have restrictive powers and that it should not be too heavily weighted in favour of conservation. Must conserve local economy too. There should be promotion of affordable housing for locals. NPA should prevent eyesores appearing and help and preserve the local architecture.</p>	<p>More locals - at least 50% of the Board. Three main groups should be represented – local, vested interests and visitors. Members should have knowledge of the area and business experience.</p>	<p>Majority in favour of “Cairngorms National Park”. There must be adequate funding from national sources for the Park. Must remain alive and for communities to enjoy working and living here. The Park must not be restrictive. Start marketing now and create infrastructure first. Do not create a theme park.</p>

<p>Kirkmichael and Tomintoul Agreement that the area meets the three criteria for designation.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed but Option A seemed most popular.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed on planning function but most support for National Park Authority. Support for single local plan.</p>	<p>More than 5 directly elected members (some said all should be local). Range of views expressed about skills , knowledge and experience of Board but include conservation, local economy, agriculture, tourism, and Parks elsewhere.</p>	<p>Unanimous support for “Cairngorms National Park”. Concern that the decisions have already been taken prior to the consultation. Consultation information very difficult to read and understand.</p>
<p>Kirriemuir Overwhelming support for the principle of a National Park.</p>	<p>General preference for a larger area (Option C). Strong support for Kirriemuir to be included to help stimulate economic and social development. Kirriemuir is a gateway town to the National Park. Local opinion should be taken into account to inform a detailed boundary.</p>	<p>No consensus whether planning should remain the responsibility of the Council or become a responsibility of NPA. Important to retain local control over planning issues. Other view is that NPA would be able to take a coherent overall approach. Concern about duplication of effort and increased red tape.</p>	<p>Local people want to influence the running of the Park. If Option C is chosen the proposed size and composition is about right. Expertise of members should tie in with the four aims. Avoid overweighing of any one group. Strong emphasis on local knowledge and local residence. Wide, regular contact with local people.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park” is the most appropriate name. NP should not have adverse effects on the peripheral areas. Concern expressed about relationships between the NPA and local tourist boards. Rights and freedoms of locals should not be compromised. Whole exercise must be properly funded.</p>

<p>Laggan Strong feeling that it was going to happen anyway and that “whatever we say will not make any difference.” Much ambivalence. Most agreed that area is of outstanding national importance because of its natural and cultural heritage. Some disagreement about coherent identity.</p>	<p>Marginal agreement that Laggan should be in it if there is to be a National Park – but some dissenting views that being outside would be gaining the best from both worlds. Views expressed ranged from Option A to the existing Cairngorms Partnership area. Most residents at Kinlochlaggan would rather not be included. Boundary should follow natural boundaries but not split communities.</p>	<p>Consensus that the local authority should be planning authority – at least they are elected. This is countered by some views that NPA with planning powers would ensure greater consistency and current planning arrangement is shambolic and inconsistent. LA should be required to consult NPA. No one felt it necessary to add to the proposed powers. Some restrictions should be imposed on holiday homes but not on farm buildings. The NPA should not be providing services itself but should work with local communities.</p>	<p>Views expressed that 25 members is about right size and that 25 is too many. NPA members should be trustees. Members should be appointed for fixed terms. Current proposals allow too many appointed by Scottish Ministers and not enough locally elected. Advisory Groups and focus groups should be used to inform the NPA. The majority of members must live within the Park area. People should be elected before the nominations and appointments.</p>	<p>Range of names suggested including “Cairngorm National Park” and “Cairngorms National Park”, latter more suitable for larger areas. The consultation document is very difficult to read. Many other issues raised.</p>
<p>Mid Deeside In general the case for the National Park was regarded as “not proven”.</p>	<p>Range of special management needs identified. Area C to take in all the special interest and surrounding communities where most people live and visitors come and go.</p>	<p>LAs should remain as the planning authority. NPA should have the maximum possible powers. The NPA will have to balance interests of national and local groups and must integrate efforts of government agencies and LAs.</p>	<p>Five directly elected members is not enough. Practical, on-the-ground knowledge is important for Board members. There should be at least one person from each community. Taxpayers should have a greater say in the running of the Park. The hills should be run by people with life-long experience of them.</p>	<p>No view on name. Range of views expressed about future management of the area.</p>

<p>Nethy Bridge Generally felt that area is meets the designated criteria.</p>	<p>Option B preferred by adults – Option C considered to be too large to administer but it would enable social and economic aims to be fulfilled. Option A preferred by children – should start small and expand if successful. Concerns that it would bring too many visitors. Grantown should be included.</p>	<p>Response evenly divided between LA and NPA as the best planning authority. Local authority needs to have a strong voice in any case. There should be single local plan for the Park. Should not be just another layer of bureaucracy. Should have fund and power to purchase land and manage specific projects. Should be able to designate access agreements and protect low cost housing from second home market.</p>	<p>Majority considered 25 to be a good number for Board. Those elected to the NPA should live locally and should not be existing councillors. All appointees should be visionaries and lateral thinkers. Those appointed by local authorities should reside permanently in the Park area.</p>	<p>Consensus overwhelmingly “Cairngorm National Park” or variations on it (e.g. "Cairn Gorm" or "Cairngorms").</p>
<p>Rothiemurchus and Glenmore General support for the proposition that there should be a National Park.</p>	<p>Clear majority for the Park being smaller rather than larger. Fears that funding would be insufficient for a larger area – easier to achieve quality in a smaller area Most people had in mind Option A with the addition of all Badenoch and Strathspey.</p>	<p>Powers to fund high quality standards and to create a unified approach to signage, car parking, etc. Make sure the Park’s commercial activities do not compete unfairly with local enterprise. Both NPA and LA need to be involved in planning processes – the NPA having a strong input to strategic planning and LA dealing with day-to-day or</p>	<p>Overwhelming majority support for maximum local representation. Local Authority nominees should be Councillors whose wards lie inside the Park boundary or Community Councillors from within the Park boundary NPA members should be appointed to work for all aims of the National Park and should have relevant management experience rather than be specialists or experts.</p>	<p>Majority in favour of “Cairngorms National Park”.</p>

		implementation level.		
--	--	-----------------------	--	--

Table 4-6: Summary of the views expressed in the independently facilitated community meetings

Abbreviations used: NPA =National Park Authority LA =Local Authority

Should a National Park be designated?	What area should a National Park cover?	What powers should the Park Authority have?	Membership of the Board of the Park Authority?	Name of the Park and other issues?
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Dalwhinnie Little discussion or no consensus.</p>	<p>Range of views. Some support for all Options.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including planning should stay with LAs. Need for more community involvement.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including desire for more local representation. Board must connect to various Advisory Groups.</p>	<p>“Cairngorm National Park”. Not enough information to decide about many of the issues.</p>
<p>Donside The area qualifies on first criterion. Already considered a special area so it should be important balancing act to achieve all 4 aims. Some reservations that the designation is needed “...because it’s well looked after now”.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for Option B plus Tarland and bits north of there in Option C, Option B. Less support for Angus Glens. Communities like Laggan or Kirriemuir don’t really look to the Cairngorms. Decisions about boundary shouldn’t be decided by money. Shouldn’t include low ground agricultural land.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including that powers suggested are too draconian. NPA needs some powers but not for compulsory purchase. Planning should remain with Local Authority and NPA should be statutory consultee. Should not be a single local plan. There is a big cultural diversity across the area. Concern about byelaws - who takes precedence? e.g. Forestry Commission or NPA?</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including that more than five members should be directly appointed by Scottish Ministers. Interests represented should include - tourism, conservation, forestry, land management, tenant farmers, fisheries, local authority, business, management, residents. Elect best individual on each interest from more than five nominations. Decision-making should be open to the public. No more talking shops - we want people to take decisions.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms Park”. Don’t start the National Park if we are not sure there is enough money to make it successful. The Park Authority should have a ‘rolling venue for meetings’.</p>
<p>Glenlivet and Inveravon Little discussion but support is implied from other comments.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for both Options A and B. From tourism point of view the Park shouldn’t just be seen as the mountain area to</p>	<p>Range of views expressed but most support for planning function remaining with LAs. Park Authority could be a referee. All residents within a Park area should have the same rules applied. Park</p>	<p>Range of views expressed but 25 members on the Board seemed about right. Most of the skills as identified are relevant to the NPA. View that more should be directly elected and less nominated by LAs. Nominated</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park “ has good recognition. Cairngorms Partnership should administer the National Park.</p>

	<p>make sure there are economic benefits for local communities. Some want Moray to be included which would have tourism benefits.</p>	<p>Authority should have limited power because it is not a wholly elected body. As many powers as is sensible should remain with LAs.</p>	<p>people should be appointed first. Scottish Executive appointments should have skills to represent the national interest. Shouldn't be a quango. NPA should be a hands-on working body and truly representative of the area and the national situation.</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

<p>Kirriemuir Landward East and West Range of views expressed including questioning along the lines of “...should not the whole of Scotland have the kind of protection and management proposed?”</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for all three options and the Cairngorms Partnership area.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed with support for both NPA and LAs holding planning powers and support for joint local authority committee. No compulsory purchase of land. Access must be arranged/ managed in consultation with owners and occupiers. SNH should advise on conservation and heritage.</p>	<p>Range of views. Scottish Executive appointees must have a relevant expertise (e.g. ecology/ economic development) and be preferably local. Support for non-political appointees and local representation in excess of 50%. Half the Board should be directly elected. Specialist on biodiversity should be on the Board.</p>	<p>Range of suggested names including “Caledonian Park” and “Grampian and Cairngorms Reserve”. Many suggestions about future management including the view that the Cairngorms Partnership approach should be continued.</p>
<p>Mount Blair Range of views expressed including the view that the area needs the mechanism of a National Park to address the issues.</p>	<p>Support for inclusion of the area because of special needs (tourism and social and economic development) and landscape quality. It's a gateway and gateways should be in Little support for Option C due to loss of 'coherent identity'.</p>	<p>Range of views. The NPA must be accountable and open. Has to be accountability so no byelaws. Should provide guidance/ codes of practice on the application of powers and functions so that there is clarity. Must be support-incentives for farmers Must manage the visitor pressures. Support for planning matters remaining with the local authority, the NPA Authority having a veto.</p>	<p>Range of views. Must not be automatic that the LA nominations are councillors. There has to be a balance between the various interests and expertise. The expertise suggested in the consultation document is fine. All Board members should be elected. Should be a staggered process to ensure there is no bias in terms of the representation and interest groups.</p>	<p>Should be a mechanism to co-ordinate and strengthen Tourist Associations</p>
<p>Newtonmore</p>				

<p>31 of 32 attendees at one meeting were in favour of establishing a National Park.</p>	<p>Range of views. Upper Spey should be in. The historic Badenoch county boundary should be the Park boundary. Exclude the area south of Braemar. The criteria for deciding the detailed boundary will be important.</p>	<p>Strong majority view that planning powers should remain with the local authority. Must not do anything which adds additional bureaucracy.</p>	<p>Range of views. Support for more local representation and elected members. Should be more than 50% directly elected local people. Board members should be appointed for a fixed term. Local authority nominations should be local members within the Park boundary. Scottish Executive should appoint members once the elections have been completed.</p>	<p>Majority view in favour of "Cairngorm National Park", not the Cairngorms National Park. Advisers to the Board must be on 'tap' not on 'top'.</p>
<p>Pitlochry and Moulin Little discussion or no consensus.</p>	<p>Range of views. Pitlochry could be capital of Highland Perthshire <u>or</u> southern gateway of National Park. There is a real debate as to which of these is better for Pitlochry. If Pitlochry is included there is logic having more/ all of Highland Perthshire included (e.g. Schiehallion). Funding likely to be limited if too great an area.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed on planning. Some say LAs should have power (to avoid draw on resources) but others say that it should be function of NPA. Co-ordination of land use and designations should be one of the roles. Byelaws important.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed but 25 seemed too large a Board. Strong call for more local representation. Appointments should not be political and should include community councillors and local residents.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed (no consensus), including "Cairngorms and Highland Perthshire National Park", "Grampian National Park" and "Caledonian National Park".</p>

<p>Rannoch and Tummel Little discussion or no consensus.</p>	<p>Range of views. Start with the core area (Option A) then grow. Makes administrative sense and cohesive area. Option then to expand or create a new Park. There is a link with Tayside and Rannoch. Include Laggan.</p>	<p>Range of views. "Could the existing local authorities not just be given the power and do it?" Don't want an extra tier of Government. No compulsion wanted.</p>	<p>Range of views. Must have a strong local representation. At least 40% of members of the Board must gain their living from the area. Smaller Board, possibly 15, will be more effective. Must be remuneration for Board and committee members if good people are to be able to stand.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed on management. Parks should not be a museum and must assist local economy. Note the impact of the Park on communities just outwith the boundary. Key is the organisation and structure of the NPA staff. Indicative cost is not enough.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

Table 4-7: Summary of the views expressed in the peripheral and additional meetings

Abbreviations used: NPA =National Park Authority LA =Local Authority

Should a National Park be designated?	What area should a National Park cover?	What powers should the Park Authority have?	Membership of the Board of the Park Authority?	Name of the Park and other issues?
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Aberfeldy Yes</p>	<p>Consensus to include at least Option A. Option B might be more appropriate for management. Concern about potential impact for areas sandwiched between two Parks. Support for middle sized Park with zoning.</p>	<p>Planning should be with NPA and should be consistent across the area. NPA must have teeth but should be positive and proactive in use of its powers. New land-use management schemes are required.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including that LAs should not automatically nominate councillors, minimum number of councillors and maximum number with commitment to the Park, no party political nominations, skills and experience of nominated members should be prioritised.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park”. Range of views expressed on future management including the importance of sustainable development. Funding should not disadvantage other areas or other environmental budgets, other agencies should receive enhanced funding too.</p>
<p>Aberlour Yes</p>	<p>Support for Option B and zoning. Support for inclusion of Ben Rinnes.</p>	<p>System based on consensus and avoidance of public inquiries.</p>	<p>Support for sub-groups to allow for increase in representation, expertise and local community involvement. Important that there is strong local representation.</p>	<p>Proposal seems very balanced.</p>
<p>Alford Yes</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for Option B and “as big a Park as possible”.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for consistency between National Parks, delivery of action plans by communities, more powers to control land-use (especially in the national interest). Also, communities should have more resources/funding and opposition to new restrictions.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for more elected representatives and more local people. Concern expressed about top-heavy administration and very strong influence of LAs.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park”. Suggestions of future management included the need for information, involvement of users and economically active people, the need for 25 year vision, public responsibilities of land-managers receiving</p>

				public support, the need for new money.
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Blairgowrie No consensus or little discussion.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including support for areas smaller than Option A, modified form of Option B and Option C.</p>	<p>Range of views on planning but perhaps most support for NPA having a strong influence on planning issues. Support for NPA and LAs to work closely together on planning issues.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including importance of appointees having knowledge and experience of mountain recreation use, links with recreational users and conservation/ ecology. Support for more directly elected members.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park” although some noted that this would be less suitable for larger area options.</p>
<p>Laurencekirk and Fettercairn Needs to be adequately funded</p>	<p>Range of views. Support for Option C, two Parks to cover the area and a smaller Park overall.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed but support for NPA to have lead role in planning, especially on rural issues. and forestry issues.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including that the Board needs to relate strongly to existing bodies and involve young people, one third should be directly elected, one third appointees and one third from LAs.</p>	<p>“Cairngorms National Park” or “Cairngorms and Grampian National Park” Range of views expressed on future management including role of gateway towns, forestry for wildlife, control of second homes, supporting farmers.</p>
<p>Mid-Atholl, Strath-Tay and Grandtully Little discussion. One comment was “Do we need a Park at all?”</p>	<p>Wide Range of views expressed including support for areas larger than option A. Concerns expressed about areas falling outwith the Park. Conflict of interest between preserving environment and encouraging tourism.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed including, planning standards should be same inside and outside the Park. Co-ordination of grants. Most support for planning to be in hands of LAs with NPA as consultee.</p>	<p>Range of views expressed but a strong call for more local representation. National and international experience may be desirable.</p>	<p>Many other specific issues including need for visitor centres and facilities, need for control of speedboats, caravan parks skiing, etc. Careful consideration must be given to areas outside the Park.</p>

	Start with the smallest area for a trial period of say 5 years.			
Pitlochry Tourism Committee Yes.	Range of views expressed including support for both inclusion and exclusion of Pitlochry, area larger than Option C.	Range of views expressed including support for planning powers remaining as at present. Some suggested planning policy should be set by NPA and administered by LAs.	Range of views expressed including support for more specialist appointees, more elected or politically appointed, local authority share decided by area and not population.	“Cairngorms National Park” or the “Highlands National Park” if Pitlochry is to be included.