

ANNEX C: ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO MAIN CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Question 1: Does the general area of Loch Lomond & the Trossachs meet the legislative conditions for designation as a National Park					
Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Agree	A/0007, A/0068, A/0104, B/0077, B/0287, B/0288, C/0223, D/0171, D/0277, H/0121, O/0097	L/0103	A/0009, A/0010, A/0043, A/0051, A/0088, A/0152, A/0158, A/0168, A/0189, A0207, A/0220, A/0247, A/0328, C/0061, C/0120, C/0175, C/0291, D/0060, E/0250, E/0266, E/0301, F/0268, F/0303, H/0195, H/0265, J/0194, K/0129, K/0208, K/0284,, K/0290, K/0298, K/0311, K/0339, L/0100, L/0218, L/0296, L/0306, L/0308, N/0155, N/0300, N/0332, N/0337, O/0114, O/0259, O/0270, O/0324	58	<p>Does the Loch Lomond and Trossachs area meet the conditions? The answer is obviously a big YES, however some of the areas that seem to want to join or are "<u>being wanted</u>" to join are not under the threat that affects the core area (A/0068).</p> <p>Argyll & Bute Council has consistently supported the principle of a National Park for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs and is of the opinion that the consultative conditions set out in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 are met within the specific parts of the general area identified in the SNH consultation document. (E/0301)</p> <p>From a scientific point of view, as well as in other respects, the general area outlined fully meets the legislative conditions for designation as a National Park - it is undoubtedly of outstanding importance (national and international) because of its natural heritage, and it has a coherent geographical identity. (O/0309)</p>
Disagree (or yet to be convinced)	A/0030, A/0098, A/0349, B/0017		C/0141	5	<p>My own view is one of mild negativism (I was one of the nay Sayers), mainly through distrust of the unknown: a normal human reaction, I think. The generalised way in which you describe the proposed plan does not address 3 key issues. Is it indeed true that more formal control would deliver better management of the land? You make no estimate of the numbers of increased visitors to the region. Compulsory purchase/ land access. I am</p>

					sorry to be negative, since the document is not bad. But you will not garner support from this particular quarter until you address these three issues.(B/0017)
Other Comments			A/0146	1	What would be the possibility and practicality of drawing a line along the length of the A82 from Balloch to Crianlarich, with all eligible interested parties to the east of that line forming one National Park, ... And the whole of the area known as Cowal, south and west of the line, and INCLUDING the Argyll Forest Park, to form another National Park, from the Kyles of Bute, Tighnabraich, Glendaruel, 'Gateway' Dunoon, Loch Eck, and up to include Inverrary, OR at least allow it to be a self contained sub division of the whole, with its own budget and administration, and if not - why not? (A/0146)

Question 2a: Views on the proposed area for inclusion – general

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for a Park area smaller than the proposed area	A/0012, A/0185, B/0154, D/0148, D/0172, L/0322,	A/0353	A/0152, A/0207, B/0310, C/0217, C/0141, O/0270	13	<p>There's a watershed running around Loch Katrine to its north, which might make a more sensibly containing boundary, without starting to pull on board bits of the lovely rest-of-Scotland, which are not really anything to do with the Trossachs. (A/0185)</p> <p>I am strongly of the opinion that the proposed National Park should cover only the Loch Lomond and Trossachs core area (1&2) without Callander, Strathyre or Balquhidder being included. (B/0154)</p>
Support for a Park area including the 'core area' only	A/0023, A/0068, A/0098, A/0133, A/0170, A/0174, A/0185, A/0199, A/0280, B/0113, B/0125, B/0211, B/0286, B/0287, C/0187, C/0201, D/0171, D/0172, D/0351, E/0122, H/0121, J/0198 L/0201, P/0292	B/0151, D/0320	A/0066, A/0275, A/0321, L/0067 F/0034, J/0194 K/0294, N/0155, N/0263, O/0259	36	<p>I have always understood that to warrant inclusion in a National Park, an area had to be under severe visitor pressure. I do not believe that any area other than the core area in pink meets this requirement and the Act leaves it open for the whole of Scotland to be included if you disregard this criteria. (A/0199)</p> <p>As there is no role model for this Park in Scotland, and as Government funding is likely to be limited it would seem unwise to extend beyond the basic core area. (B/0211)</p> <p>The Authority would support the designation of the 'core' area detailed in the Consultation Document. (H/0121)</p> <p>The area must be limited to that identified for inclusion within the proposals. The boundary must conform to this area, excluding 'strong' and 'weak' case areas. (J/0194)</p> <p>Concentrating on the core area would enable the Park Board to adopt a focussed approach to the important issues facing the area. Furthermore, establishing the core area as the Park boundary should allow for the concentrated application of funding which might otherwise be dispersed more thinly. Ideally therefore, the Park should comprise of the core area</p>

					coloured pink on the map accompanying the consultation document. (N/0155)
Support for a Park area initially comprising the core area, with a subsequent review considering the inclusion of other areas	A/0023, A/0170, A/0199, A/0280, B/0125, B/0211, B/0262, D/0171	D/0091, D/0320	A/0321, E/0250, N/0155	13	<p>With regard to the Argyll Forest Park, the area north of Crianlarich and around Loch Earn I am of opinion that they should be excluded for the time being. There is no reason why the position should not be reviewed say, in five or ten years. (A/0199)</p> <p>As SNH propose that the aims and visions for the Park should be reviewed every 5 years, it follows that in the initial stages it would be better to start small and with the experience of true difficulties as well as the true costs involved, size can be increased if considered necessary at regular intervals. Conversely, it would be virtually impossible to reduce the size at regular intervals. (D/0171)</p> <p>Stirling Council considers that the effectiveness of the National Park should be monitored and the boundaries reviewed, with a view to re-examining the inclusion of additional "strong case" areas within 5 years. (E/0250)</p>
Support for the Park area proposed in the consultation paper and/or larger than the 'core area'	A/0014, A/0053, A/0065, A/0166, A/0107, A/0210, A/0278, K/0094		A/0043, A/00/65, A/0107, A/0139, A/0152, C/0209, E/0250, F/0119, G/0228, H/0195, H/0248, K/0129, L/0308, L/0322	22	<p>If the park is confined to the size of the core area proposed, zoning and effective visitor management within the park boundaries will be difficult to achieve and unpopular. (A/0139)</p> <p>We consider that the proposed "core area" requires to be enlarged to take in some of the areas under debate. (K/0094)</p> <p>We believe that unless the boundaries of the National Park are extended beyond the core area, the Park will be grossly over-crowded and will be in danger of destroying what is being sought to preserve. (C/0209)</p> <p>Based on the above premise, sportscotland supports as an underlying concept, a larger, rather than a smaller area for a National Park in Loch Lomond and the Trossachs (G/0228)</p>
View that the size of the Park and its budget needed to be considered at the	A/0068, A/0166 A/0170, B/0113, D/0148, D/0351		A/0009, C/0227, H/0267, L/0067, L/0218, N/0155	12	Comparison with the size of National Parks in England and Wales, suggests that the area provisionally proposed for the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park should not be too large for its effective management, providing it is adequately resourced. (A/0166)

same time					<p>Funding for the park will be limited and so needs to be concentrated on key areas. This suggests a general principle that optional areas should be excluded unless there is a very good reason to include them. Since the south west Loch Tay and Glen Lochay areas are better connected to the Breadalbane/Ben Lawers area they should be out. The Argyll Forest Park has few links to the core area and should also be out. (B/0113)</p> <p>The finance available to the Park Authority will undoubtedly be limited and as a result we feel it would be preferable that the National Park only includes the core area of the Loch Lomond catchment and the Trossachs where the Authority could make the greatest and most effective contribution with the limited resources available. (H/0267)</p>
-----------	--	--	--	--	--

Question 2b): Views on the proposed area for inclusion – comments on specific areas

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for the inclusion of Glen Fruin	A0068, D/0110, D/0202, D/0225, H/0261, K/0094	A/0213	A/0079, A/0088, A/0149, A/0182, A/0193, A/0219, A/0221, A/0350, D/0109, F/0235, K/0075, K/0150, L/0074, C/0063, C/0120	22	<p>At the meeting the majority of those present were in favour of the park and for including Garelochhead, Glen Fruin and Rosneath within it. I would argue that the inclusion Glen Fruin, Garelochhead and the Rosneath peninsula within the boundaries of the park meets the Scottish Executive's aspirations for enhancing a rural area of natural beauty and culture, whilst also meeting the conditions required of a national park.(A/0088)</p> <p>I would like to submit that there is significant historical interest in this area – e.g. the Colquhoun battles in Glen Fruin, the strong connection with St. Andrew in Rosneath, the sinking of the K13 submarine in the Gareloch during the first world war and the sailors graves in the Faslane Cemetery, and many more facts which could be ascertained from local historians. Also geographically this area has always been linked with Loch Lomond as the traditional “Three Lochs Tour” linked Loch Lomond, Loch Long and the Gareloch. If tourism could be developed towards this area it would take some of the pressure off Loch Lomond.(A/0079)</p> <p>If the Argyll Forest Park is to be included, consideration should also be given to including the east side of Loch Long, notwithstanding the MOD presence, on account of its scenery and recreational potential. In this case, Helensburgh would make a suitable gateway to the National Park and could be inside or outside the National Park.(C/0063)</p> <p>Whilst it is recognized that there is an absence of nationally important designations, the area [Glen Fruin] does have natural heritage interest. Whilst not having the dramatic landscape and mix of features of the Core Area the Glen does signify the start of the rising slopes of the Luss Hills. The Fruin is important for salmonid spawning although being secondary in importance to the River Endrick. Inclusion in the National Park would allow comprehensive management of a natural, dynamic river system. It is considered that the absence of the plethora of designations covering the Endrick on the Fruin, heightens the need for this important tributary to Loch</p>

					Lomond to be afforded the protection of National Park status. The area also has historical and cultural importance including the site of the Battle of Glen Fruin, in addition to the interests identified by SNH. The cultural and links are strongly with Loch Lomondside as evidenced by the historic estate management of the area. It is accepted that the present landscape quality of Upper Glen Fruin is not as high as the wider Core Area. The area is nevertheless considered to share characteristic of the transition between the highlands and the lowlands and should not be viewed in terms of undermining the coherence of the proposed National Park. The advantages of inclusion, especially looking to the long term and the opportunities for landscape improvement and recreation, are considered to outweigh the limitations in other areas of the assessment. (H/0261)
Support for the exclusion of Glen Fruin	B/0077		A/0039	2	I do not believe that it contributes to the Park's aspirations nor does it appear to gain economically from inclusion. (A/0039)
Support for the inclusion of the Roseneath Peninsula		A/0213	A/0011, A/0029, A/0079, A/0088, A/0093, A/0108, A/0140, A/0149, A/0158, A/0182, A/0193, A/0214, A/0219, A/0221, A/0274, C/0063, F/0235, F/0352, K/0150	20	<p>The moors above are floristically rich having a very large colony of the rare Narrow Buckler Fern, <i>Dryopteris carthusiana</i> and a sizeable colony of Green Hairstreak Butterfly. We gather that the presence of the naval base at Faslane might render the Gareloch side unappealing, but while the south-west proposed boundary could come much closer to the Loch as the area of the higher hills ie. Dounce Hill and Ben Mhanaich have an interesting montane flora. If Glen Douglas and the Greenfiled Garelochhead Training Camp area were unsuitable for inclusion, the line Glen Douglas – Balloch could advance considerably, excluding these two places to the very great benefit of the rather run-down neglected and demoralised areas – Cardross and Helensburgh. (A/0093)</p> <p>We believe that consideration should be given to including the area of Garelochhead and the Rosneath Peninsula. The area has abundant wildlife and some ancient woodland remnants near Portincaple and up to 13 different historical sites within a small area between Whistlefield and Garelochhead. It is surrounded by land which is in the NP and it seems inequitable to exclude it. There are also strong economic arguments for its inclusion. (A.0221)</p>

Support for the inclusion of River Leven			A/066	1	One area currently entirely excluded which must be included if you are to properly husband your major resource is the River Leven and its environs.(A/0066)

Question 2c: Views on the proposed area for inclusion – comments on boundaries

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
General points	A/0012, A/0016, C/0187, C/0238, D/0123, H/0121, H/0145		A/0220, C/0120, C/0291, E/0301, H/0195, K/0231, J/0194, K/0273, K/0284, K/0290, L/0308, L/0322, L/0325	20	<p>Ultimately, I still fee that keeping everything within sight of the main routes around the potential Park would provide a sensible boundary. Please see attached map. That way, purely from a visitor's perspective, all that they see following major transport routes would be within the Park until there was a definite landscape change. (A/0220)</p> <p>It seems to me that the consideration of the boundaries of the Park itself should also address the question of sub-areas within the Park so that local interest groups can have an opportunity of focussing on the minutiae of boundaries in order to avoid the absurdities which often arise when lines are drawn on maps. (C/0238)</p> <p>There should be no automatic assumption that local administrative boundaries should coincide with the Park boundaries. However, we have some concern that not including small areas on the periphery of both the Park and local authority areas, could lead to an element of social exclusion in some more remote communities and care should be taken to avoid this, where inclusion would not significantly dilute the Park's identity and purposes. (H/0195)</p> <p>Experience elsewhere has shown that once the boundaries are set in any National Park it has taken a very long time and considerble expense to have any aread added subsequently. It is therefore essential that the inclusive view of the Park area must be taken from the start. (L/0322)</p>
Need for a buffer zones	A/0164		A/0341, L/0335	3	A 'buffer zone' may be thought desirable to deter deelopment on the edge of the National Park which may have an impact on the Park. (L/0335)
Boundary should not split land and water management units	A/0102, A/0007, B/0183, B/0211	B/0027	A/0147, A/0220 J/0194, J/0233, L/0325	10	The boundary detail should be worked out on the ground and emphasis should be placed on land owning/management areas rather than arbitrarily following roads and rivers. Many of these estates boundaries follow natural watershed/course areas and for estates to be fully in or out would be far more beneficial than splitting them. If estates have to be split, it should only occur where present management would not be affected, ie. deer management areas. (A/0220)

					<p>Farm holdings should not be divided by the boundary because to do otherwise would cause friction between land managers and the Park Authority and complicate project management. (J/0233)</p> <p>In general it is desirable to have a single management regime (or none) on any navigable expanse of inland water. In so the boundaries of the Loch should not include one part of the Loch and exclude another. (L/0325)</p>
Boundary should use water catchments	A/0102, A/0191, A/0139, A/0210, A/0260, D/0153	D/0320, B/0090	A/0032, A/0033, A/0066 A/0111, A/0189, A/0220, A/0222 A/0328, C/0209, C/0227, D/0162, G/0329, J/0233, K/0150, K/0212, K/0231, K/0273, K/0290, K/0294, K/0311, K/0343, L/0067, L/0218, L/0308, L/0322, L/0348	34	<p>Establishing the limits of the Park along the watersheds of the 'front line' hills does not conform to the conditions for the identification of the area of a National Park. It will in the longer term defeat the achievement of the SNH reason 2 for supporting the creation of NP and weaken the possibility of the achievement of the reason 1. It will also undermine the reasons 3 & 4. There is no argument, derived either from the aims of a National Park or the conditions for the identification of a National Park, for cutting the area in half along the watershed. The aims and conditions imply that it should extend to the upland fringe, have a clear scenic identity and constitute an obvious single entity, inclusive of all the land with similar characteristics of geology, land form and landuse, with all the lochs, all the mountains, all the woodlands and all the less inhabited areas included. All planning decisions applicable to developments in this wider area should be judged in relation to similar criteria. (A/0139)</p> <p>In all instances we are concerned that land boundaries should lie on watersheds with discrete catchment areas being included. This not only gives a natural appearance to the boundary but will facilitate effective management. Marine boundaries should ideally for similar reasons be shorelines. This will be achievable for Loch Goil and Holy Loch, but we recognise that in the case of Loch Long and Loch Fyne it may be inevitable that unnatural midline boundaries may be required. (D/0162)</p> <p>Boundaries should follow watersheds wherever possible, water being your major resource and watersheds having historically formed the boundaries in this region. (A/0066)</p>

					<p>The major role in water catchment management surely points to the benefit of having the boundaries of the proposed National Park along watersheds where possible. This is in any event the natural boundary between different areas. This is the boundary that SNH itself suggests should be used in the section of the paper at page 38 on Consideration of Boundaries. (D/0320)</p> <p>A serious problem is that, in some places, water catchments are to be only partly within the Park boundary. I realise that the only way to avoid splitting catchments would be to make the Park boundary coincide with the Loch Lomond catchment, and that a park larger than that must inevitably result in split catchments. However, the Park authorities must then be prepared to accept that the greater the number of split catchments, the greater the number of complications to cope with. (L/0067)</p>
Boundary should not split towns and villages	A/0191	D/0056	A/0033, A/0328 C/0291, H/0248, K/0231, K/0273 K/0290, K/0294 K/0311 L/0308, L/0322 O/0259	14	<p>"Gateway settlements" should generally be in the "peripheral zone", not the core area. (A/0033)</p> <p>On the issues of boundaries, I think large towns and communities on the Park borders should be excluded, but smaller communities and villages on the borders should be included as these smaller populations are more than likely to derive their existence from the Park area. They are likely to be all concerned with the economic and cultural objectives that the park is all about. (A/0191)</p> <p>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. (K/290)</p> <p>SANA considers that the settlements on the fringes should also be included in the Park. It is unfair/undemocratic to roll out the park to their back door and effectively disenfranchise them by not including them, and so preventing them having any say on what happens within the Park. (L/0322)</p> <p>All groups recognised the importance of "gateways" to the National Park and wanted to see that the boundary included these important centres for</p>

					information, services and education. (O/259)
Comments on the boundary of the core area	A/0068, A/0138, A/0133, A/0174, A/0185, A/0205, A/0206, A/0278, B/0113, C/0184, C0239, D/0110, D/0123, H/0261, K/0094, P/0292		A/0033, A/0112, A/0221, C/0063, C/0089, C/0217, C/0291, E/0122, E/0250, G/0126, H/0195	27	<p>This is the first consultation to include the major quarry at Cambusmore. This is the largest quarry in Stirling District. The consultation map also includes an uninspiring area of flat lowland grassland over which the quarry have existing planning consent. We suggest there is no case for their inclusion and good reason to exclude them and so recommend the detailed boundary shown on the enclosed extracts from your Maps 9 and 13. (B/0130)</p> <p>The A81 is a good boundary between the upland of the Menteith hills and the lowland area of Flanders Moss and Lake of Menteith. (C/0063)</p> <p>We would suggest that the Park boundary in this area include the area around the Lake of Menteith as well as the young woodlands to the west of Flanders Moss, the east of the A81 and the north of the B835. (G/0126)</p> <p>I can see a case for extending the boundary locally to follow the A81/B834, the argument for this being similar to that for including the A84 and A85. This alteration would include Gartness and Croftamie within the National Park. (C/0063)</p> <p>I support the inclusion of the land lying to the west of the A81 from Gartmore to Killearn Smiddy crossroads and then north of the road across Cameron Muir to the west. All as shown on the attached plan. The reason for the change is that the A81 is a more suitable boundary than the Drymen to Gartmore Road and the change would result in the inclusion of the whole Queen Elizabeth Forest Park together with the Pots of Gartness and the gorge immediately south of Finnick Toll (for which there would have to be a small detour in the boundary). The amended boundary along the Cameron Muir road seems to be more appropriate than the original proposal. (A/0278)</p> <p>We also consider that the area between the unclassified road running north of Drymen and the A81 should be included within the Park, so including part of the Queen Elizabeth Forest Park, which is presently excluded. (K/0094)</p> <p>Only the proposal that the boundary be located closer to the shoreline of the</p>

				<p>loch would appear to meet with the three conditions for the identification of the park and the principles adopted in the identifying the current boundary. The suggestions that the areas of Balloch to the north of Lomond Road, or indeed a greater area incorporating the built-up area to the south are not considered sustainable, since they do not comprise areas of "outstanding national importance" whether in natural or cultural heritage terms. In addition, whilst this area relates only to a small part of the proposed National Park, it is difficult to see how the inclusion of the built-up area contributes to the park having either a distinctive character or coherent identity. Whilst acknowledging the socio-economic aim of the proposed designation, it is also questioned whether the inclusion of any of the built-up areas of Balloch would meet the needs of either those areas or those of the National Park. (C/0217)</p> <p>The inclusion of part of Balloch would produce a potentially unworkable and confusing situation in terms of land use planning, with one side of the street being subject to additional planning policies than apply to the other. The drawing of a line through an urban area does not reflect the sider aims of clarity and could be viewed as an additional level of needless bureaucracy. (C/0291)</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity of the boundary through Balloch town centre, which should be resolved. We would recommend that the entire area to the north of the A811 should be included along with the river and adjacent frontages as far south as the River Leven Barrage. It is particularly important that the commercial area on either side of Balloch Road is not divided and it is also essential that Balloch Castle Country Park should be included as this will have an important role to play in absorbing and managing visitor pressures. (H/0195)</p> <p>We enclose detailed map showing the preferred boundary for the Balloch Village area. It runs along the A811 with everything north of that road through thre village being within the National Park. (D/0110)</p> <p>The boundary proposed by SNH excludes an area North of Callander which is currently within the boundary of the Interim Committee. This area is north</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>of the Bracklinn Falls, which is an important recreational area, providing opportunities for circular walks around Callander and there are management issues in relation to the access. In landscape terms this area is coherent with the adjacent areas which are proposed for inclusion in the National Park, and it is recommended that the boundary is extended to include this area. (H/0261)</p> <p>The core area and the natural 'northern gateways' should be the watershed in Glen Falloch and Glen Ogle. (P/0292)</p>
Comments on the boundary of the Glen Fruin, Garelochhead and Helensburgh area	A/0191, D/0110, K/0094		A/0112, A/0169, A/0219, F/0235	7	<p>The boundary should be the ridge south west of the old single-track road in the Glen. The top end of the Glen is Ministry of Defence property. In taking in this latter area, there is a case for the boundary to follow the fence alongside of the Garelochhead by-pass and then encompass the east side of Loch Long, as shown on the appended Map 2. (K/0094)</p>
Comments on the boundary of the Argyll Forest Park area	A/0191, A/0210, A/0278, A/0139, B/0183, D/0153, H/0261, K/0094		A/0047, A/0169, A/0222, C/0209, C/0240, D/0162, F/0119, G/0230, G/0228 G/0336, H/0195, L/0130	20	<p>... the park boundary should include the Garrachra Glen and its burn, in support of Nick Halls, Secretary of the Mountaineering Council of Scotland. I would be looking for a boundary line along Glenshellish Burn. I should like a boundary to take in An Creachan and perhaps even to include Loch Tarsan. Has the value of the tidal flat at the end of Holy Loch, been considered as a worthwhile site for watching birds? This might effect a decision as to whether the boundary of the extended Park is placed on the east of west side of Holy Loch. (A/0047)</p> <p>The entire area of the Holy Loch to the HWST line should be included to ensure a holistic management of the sensitive mud flats, a rare habitat in west Scotland and important to a wide range of birds, invertebrates and plants. (A/0222)</p> <p>From the recreational point of view, we believe that it would be of great benefit to extend the Park boundaries to the north and west of the Argyll Forest Park. By including the Corasik ridge to the south west, Glen Massan, an area of outstanding natural beauty, the area to the west including Glendaruel and finally up to include the hills north of Butterbridge, we believe a more cohesive and coherent area would be created. All of this area provides idealic mountain landscapes for outdoor recreation. (C/0209)</p>

					<p>Excluding part of the Forest Park would create a further artificial administrative boundary and serves little purpose. (H/0195)</p> <p>While in general agreement with the proposed boundary for the Argyll Forest Park, there are some minor adjustments which the Club would like to suggest. In particular, in the area of the River Massan some movement of the boundary further west would take in the catchment waters of that river. We assume such matters can be considered at a later stage. (L/0130)</p>
Comments on the boundary of the Strathfillan and West Glen Dochart area	A/0138, B/0038 B/0132, H/0261, K/0180	B/0090	A/0152, C/0063, K/0311, L/0308	10	<p>The northern boundary of the Park should follow the watershed between Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay with the latter excluded, being an integral part of Breadalbane. (A/0138)</p> <p>I consider that the northern boundary of the Park, as shown on the detailed maps provided to me, requires to be changed because:- (a) It contravenes the principles (nos 1, 2, 4 & 10) laid down in Annex 3, Pages 38 & 39. (b) If the Park is to include land outwith the core area, then the same criteria must apply. Ben More/Stob Beinian and Ben Lui/Oss/Ben Dubhcraig have been included because of botanic interest and mountaineering pressure, therefore our high tops of Ben Challum and Ben an Imeran, for the same reasons, should be included also. (f) We suggest that the northern boundary of the Park should follow the watershed round the Loch Dochart Estate March and progress eastwards until it follows the Allt Riobain southwards to the main road. This would fit in with your desire to find a boundary between Strathfillan and Lower Glen Dochart. Also it would lead southwards to the Allt Corrie Choarach, which would allow the Boundary to enter Balquhiddy Glen at an appropriate point. (B/0038)</p> <p>... either the A82 or the West Highland Railway Line would make a suitable boundary in Strathfillan. (C/0063)</p>
Comments on the boundary of the East Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay area	A/0102	B/0027, D/0320, D/0056, K/0232 L/0103	A/0043, C/0063, G/0228, H/0069 H/0195, L/0308	12	<p>If West Glen Dochart and Lochearnhead are included in the park boundary (which I would strongly support), there would then be a strong case for including also that part of Glen Ogle and East Glen Dochart to the west and south of the A85 (the boundary could be drawn along the A85 road itself, or the River Dochart, or to the north of the river to protect the immediately</p>

					<p>adjacent landscape, as it proposed for West Glen Dochart). (A/0043)</p> <p>... the A85 seems a more sensible boundary than the watershed on either side of Glen Dochart (C/0063)</p> <p>In practical terms, the inclusion of Killin and the area up to the watershed above Glen Dochart and Strathfillan, would also provide the potential confusion created by leaving and then re-entering the park while driving along the A85, with little discernible difference in landscape to the less "expert" eye. (H/0195)</p>
<p>Comments on the boundary of the Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich area</p>	<p>A/0138, A/0245, A/0278, B/0113, D/0099, D/0110, D/0171, H/0261, K/0094, K/0180</p>		<p>A/0040, A/0066, E/0266, F/0268 K/0231, L/0218 L/0308</p>	17	<p>I favour the Park boundaries lying along the local authority boundaries and relying on joint management of the loch between the Park authority and the local authority. The boundary of the Park should be that of the watershed of Ben Vorlich, a very appropriate landmark mountain. (A/0278)</p> <p>The proposed boundary following the old railway line along the northern shore would appear to meet the needs of the local area exceedingly well, in that it gives the protection of Park status to the village of St Fillans and to Loch Earn, without needlessly including the landmass to the north. (D/099)</p> <p>However, the boundary ought not to be drawn along the northern shore of Loch Earn, but along the northern watershed to include the hillsides north of the loch. (K/0180)</p>

Question 3: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of the Argyll Forest Park

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for the inclusion of the Forest Park	A/0016, A/0045, A/0053, A/0065, A/0138, A/0139, A/0144, A/0191, A/0210, B/0077, C/0223, D/0110, D/0153, D/0225, H/0261, K/0094, K/0180, M/0062, O/0097, O/0127		A/0010, A/0040, A/0043, A/0047, A/0059, A/0105, A/0134, A/0147, A/0051, A/0152 A/0157, A/0168, A/0189, A/0221, A/0222, C/0050, C/0061, C/0175, C/0209, C/0227, C/0240, D/0076, D/0162, F/0119, G/0126, G/0228, H/0190, H/0195, H/0241, H/0248, K/0163, K/0196, L/0130, K/0231, L/0100, L/0176, L/0218, L/0229, L/0348, N/0332, O/0114, O/0309	62	<p>It could be argued that the natural heritage of the area is as significant as the core area and certainly has the potential to be enhanced through good land management strategies. The Argyll Forest Park is coherent with the core area, having wooded slopes, mountains, lochs, swift rivers, unique fauna between Loch Eck and Loch Lomond and its catchment rivers. It has 30 hills over 2000ft. Including the Argyll Forest Park would give a south-westerly access to the Park, one hour from Glasgow by Car/Ferry, train/ferry, bus/ferry to Dunoon, which is well able to absorb the influx of people and service them before entry into the Park. (A/0191)</p> <p>Managed access to areas of managed coniferous woodland will enhance the visitors understanding of the economic necessity and indeed enjoyment of a commercial working forest. (B/0077)</p> <p>Argyll Forest park is located near to Loch Lomond. It is owned by the Forestry Commission as is the Queen Elizabeth Forest Park. It is an area where recreation could be developed. Variety is an important element in a park (D/0255)</p> <p>Strachur Community Council consider that the Argyll Forest Park should be included in the proposed National Park in order to protect the unique freshwater SSSI of Loch Eck from any increase in numbers of motorised craft transferring to it from Loch Lomond. With both freshwater Lochs in the National Park and under the same regulations, protection would be afforded to both areas. (D/0076)</p> <p>As indicated above, we are supportive of the inclusion of this area as identified in Map 2 of the consultation document. Local community groups and residents in that area have also indicated to us their support for inclusion. The Argyll Forest Park has a long history of management for public access and shares many of the qualities found in the landscape around the core Loch Lomond and Trossach area. In fact the area in Cowal</p>

					<p>now managed by Forest Enterprise was originally presented to the Corporation of the City of Glasgow by Mr T Cameron Corbett in 1906 so that 'large numbers of mothers and children from congested areas of Glasgow should be taken to Ardgool by steamer in the summer'. Subsequently transferred to the Forestry Commission, this historical association with Glasgow and outdoor recreation is a strong link to the concept of a National Park now being pursued in Loch Lomond and the Trossachs. (L/0176)</p> <p>The addition of this area would offer greater number of recreation and visitor management options for the Park and offer the opportunity to draw some visitors away from the more heavily visited core area. The Cowal Peninsula would offer an alternative gateway into the Park, via the ferries across the Clyde Estuary. The National park would also bring positive benefits in terms of the social and economic regeneration of the area. (H/0261)</p> <p>Although this region might appear as a separate limb extending south-west from the core area of the National Park, its steep hillsides and the presence of Loch Goil/Loch Long and Loch Eck give it similarities in character. The area has suffered extensive disfiguration from commercial forestry, and there is urgent need for restructuring and diversification of the plantations. The National Park could give extra impetus to this work. These factors, together with its traditional popularity with visitors and the strength of local support for National Park status, would make a very good case for inclusion. (K/0180)</p>
Support for the inclusion of the whole of the Forest Park, and also some of surrounding areas	A/0139, B/0183, O/0127		A/0222, C/0063, D/0162, O/0343	7	<p>The entire area of the Holy Loch to the WHST line should be included to ensure a holistic management of the sensitive mud flats, a rare habitat in west Scotland and important to a wide range of birds, invertebrates plants. (A/0222)</p> <p>I consider the area to be of outstanding natural, rugged, beauty with Loch Eck, which is a fjord like loch with high mountains on each side. The area at the southern end contains Benmore Botanical Gardens, which I consider to be the jewel in the crown of this area. Close by is the famous Pucks Glen Gorge which has been popular walk locally for generations. It is in need of path and bridge repairs and I feel if included in the Park it would be high</p>

				<p>priority. A mile south is the Forest Gardens or Arboretum at Kilmun which was created in 1933 and planted with around 260 different species of trees on an experimental basis. Once again the pathways could be greatly improved at no great cost.(F/0119)</p> <p>Glen Masson name is derived from Glen Mhor Eassan the glen of the "big waterfall". This has been a local beauty spot for years (100) The falls should be included. (B/0183)</p> <p>The marine area should be extended to include the west side of Loch Long to Strone and the whole of the Holy Loch. This will enhance the marine element within the National Park. This extension will conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage; promote sustainable use of natural resources; promote understanding and enjoyment by the public; promote sustainable economic and social development in the area: and give significant potential for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity within the National Park. A coherent marine dimension will be added to the National Park. The fish population in Loch Eck is unique in containing all species of salmonids including powan and charr, some of which are migratory. The Loch Eck, Holy Loch, River Massan and River Echaig system should be protected and conserved within the National Park. Recreational opportunities will be enhanced for residents and visitors alike.(D/0162)</p> <p>Large uninhabited areas, requiring little immediate investment, which are not currently subject to heavy recreational pressure are not being considered for inclusion, but form an integral part of the cultural and natural heritage of the area and should be included to meet the aims. For example, the large area west of Loch Lomond, across towards Loch Awe. [See Appendix 2, Cultural & Geographical Unit.] To meet reason 2 this area has to be included to manage the latent informal recreation potential of the east west long distance routes from the eastern side of the NP to Loch Awe side. A park of this scale will allow the gradual dilution of recreational pressure which threatens particularly Loch Lomond side and the central Trossachs. (A/0139)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Support for the inclusion of the Forest Park and also the whole of Cowal	A/0007, A/0131, A/0139, A/0210, B/0183		A/0169, A/0179, C/0050, C/0178, C/0209, D/0162,	11	<p>Management of wildlife will be made difficult unless the park boundary extends to the edge of the upland area, or at least to the watershed above the drainage into Loch Awe, and in Cowal to above the drainage into Loch Fyne, Loch Riddon and Loch Striven. The inclusion of the whole of the Cowal peninsula is worthy of consideration. Southern Cowal is an area of outstanding natural beauty, and its fiord type coastline is equally worthy of the level of protection to be provided by a N.P. (A/0139)</p> <p>As a member of the local tourist board, I feel that the whole of the Cowal Peninsular should be also included. We have surrounding the peninsular some of the greatest sailing waters in the world and some of the finest scenery, if the Cowal Peninsular were to be included in the proposals then access from the south to the National Park could be gained from the well placed town of Dunoon.(C/0050)</p> <p>We can see that the inclusion of Cowal in its entirety is an attractive proposition. It adds a significant marine dimension; adds greatly to the potential for enhancement of biodiversity; adds to the cultural heritage; provides an added route for visitors entering and leaving the National Park area; and would include the world-famous Kyles of Bute. Having said this, we have not studied other areas within Cowal and are unsure as to how well the area, as a whole, will score against the criteria. We therefore strongly suggest that a formal assessment of Cowal as a whole could be undertaken, as has been done for all the other areas under consideration, to determine the merits of inclusion on the same basis as for the other areas. (D/0162)</p>
Support for excluding the Forest Park	A/0023, A/0068, A/0098, A/0102, A/0106, A/0166, A/0170, A/0174, A/0185, A/0199, A/0205, B/0113, B/0154, C/0187, D/0123, D/0171, D/0172, D/0225, D/0351, J/0095	A/0151, C/0159, D/0091, B/0027, L/0103	A/0009, A/0031, A/0033, A/0039, A/0057, A/0066, A/0093, A/0112, A/0158, A/0192, A/0204, A/0207, A/0220, A/0249, A/0321, B/0155, C/0063, C/0120, E/0122, E/0250,	50	<p>I do not agree with the enlargement of the proposed area to include the area around Loch Eck and between Loch Eck and Loch Goil. I consider this area is too remote from the main area of the proposed Park and its addition makes the park too large and unwieldy and difficult to manage. What benefit can the area gain from National Park status that could not be provided by Argyll and Bute Council or the Forestry Commission? (A/0031)</p> <p>It is hard to make a decision on the Cowal area. It is very scenic and fits easily into the "hill, loch and river" theme and has great potential for recreational development. However, it has weak cultural links with the core</p>

			<p>F/0034, J/0194, L/0067, M/0048, O/0078</p>	<p>area and the addition of such a large area to the Park could dilute resources and make integrated management very difficult. I believe it should not be in the Park at this time, the core area should be established first. (A/0102)</p> <p>The one area I can see absolutely no justification for inclusion is area 19 the Argyll Forest which is totally divorced from the core areas by Loch Long, brings in mainly soft wood forest and only has 3 SSSI compared to many of the other potential areas. (B/0155)</p> <p>In our view for example the arguments deployed in favour of the inclusion of the Argyll Forest Park seem to us to have a manufactured quality about them and to arise from the perceived inadequacies of other organisations which should be capable of providing adequate integrated management for the area, the Forest Park Authority, the Tourist Board, the Enterprise Board and the Local Authority. Indeed the arguments advanced clearly demonstrate an unrealistic expectation of the NPA that it can somehow produce an economic rescue package for the area. (D/0091)</p> <p>We have no objections to the inclusion of Arrocher and the immediate surrounding area on the grounds that it is only just over a mile from the head of Loch Lomond and therefore conforms to the advice in Area a) above. While we appreciate the desire for the largest land owner, the Forestry Commission to include the Argyll Forest Park to facilitate the management of that area this not make it a sufficient reason to extend the National Park. Culturally and historically there is little to recommend it. It would be introducing an entirely new physical environment as Loch Lomond and the Trossachs are freshwater and have special sporting and environmental features, which belong to a fresh water environment while Loch Long and the Argyll Forest Area, are mainly salt water. Your section 3-12 sums up all the cultural and historical differences. In extensive consultation with residents in this and our surrounding areas we have not found a single person in favour. (D/0171)</p> <p>This extensive area of land should not be included within the National Park. The forest park is a very attractive area with its blend of hills, water and forests but its landscape is not the same as Loch Lomond and Trossachs</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>landscape - it does not, therefore, form part of a cohesive area. It is more remote and does not suffer the same visitor pressures and it can be adequately managed as a forest park rather than needing the special measures of a National Park. Such a major extension of the core area would extend the management requirements and overall costs of the National Park to an unacceptable extent. (E/0122)</p> <p>This is undoubtedly attractive countryside, although perhaps not of quite the same high degree of interest as the core areas. It is unlikely that it would have been considered for national park status except for the chance of it being located adjoining the Loch Lomond area and the Association is concerned that nothing should be done which might be thought to dilute high standards which should apply in the selection of land for national park status. There is also the consideration that the total funding available should be sufficient to ensure the maintenance of high standards within the first national park in Scotland, and too wide a designation might result in insufficient resources for conservation and development. The Association therefore has some reservation as to the wisdom of seeking to extend the boundary of the park to include this area unless it is clear that the recreational potential will justify this action and that sufficient resources will be made available to the park authority to develop its full recreational potential without putting risk to the conservation and development of the core area of the park. (M/0048)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Question 4: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of Strathfillan and West Glen Dochart

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for inclusion of Strathfillan and West Glen Dochart	A/0104, A/0016, A/0053, A/0170, A/0191, C/0200, C/0256, D/0110, D/0171, D/0225, G/0046, H/0261, K/0094, K/0180, O/0127	B/0090, K/0232, L/0103	A/0009, A/0010, A/0040, A/0043, A/0051, A/0059, A/0092, A/0168, A/0189, A/0220, C/0061, C/0063, C/0120, E/0122, G/0228, H/0195, H/0248, K/0163, K/0212, K/0231, L/0100, L/0218, L/0229, M/0048, N/0332, O/0078	44	<p>This area should be included in the park. The area includes two very important mountains, Ben Lui and Ben More. Both mountains hold a special place in the affections of walkers and climbers and should be protected for the future. Moreover, there has been a number of insensitive developments in the Tyndrum and Crianlarich area. It is vital that future developments be sympathetic to the outstanding natural environment nearby, and this can best be achieved by including these settlements within the park. (A/0051)</p> <p>I am firmly in favour of Tyndrum, Crianlarich and Killin with the Glen Dochart catchment area to the skyline north to be within the Park. They will comprise excellent gateways from the west (Tyndrum), from the east (Killin) and Crianlarich for its rail and road access to the northern end of the Park. Again I believe the boundary should be drawn to include catchment areas. (A/0191)</p> <p>The whole of Strathfillan should be included in the NP providing the management body is democratically accountable. It would be unacceptable for part of our community council area to be included and part excluded. I believe that our inclusion could present a significant marketing benefit particularly for tourism and farming if handled correctly. (C/0200)</p> <p>If the boundaries of the Park are to be extended this would be a much more logical addition, particularly Strathfillan. Glen Dochart is not quite so appropriate from a scenic point of view. Certainly Strathfillan is more of a Highland nature but still conforms to the Mountain, Loch and Forest theme. Historically and culturally this area qualifies, but we are still of the opinion that limiting the size in the first instance is desirable with the ability to include the area at a later stage. (D/0171)</p> <p>Crianlarich is one of the most signposted communities on Scottish roads. It lies at a major transportation point for both roads and railway and could play an important role as a gateway settlement in the National Park. Similarly,</p>

					<p>Tyndrum has the opportunity to function as a gateway settlement. In addition, the mountains in Strathfillan and West Glen Dochart - notably Ben Lui, Ben More and Stob Binnein, are extremely popular and this area would benefit from being managed within the National Park.(E/0122)</p> <p>There is no doubt that the area contains a wealth of nationally important natural heritage interest and scenic qualities, including the Ben More range SSSI and the Ben Lui range National Nature Reserve. The area is also of significant cultural heritage importance and has associations with St Fillan and early Christian times, as well as associations with former lead mining activities. The settlements of Tyndrum and Crianlarich whilst not displaying outstanding built environments, nevertheless act as key gateway settlements. They also act as important centres associated with the significant recreational opportunities of the surrounding mountains. (H/0261)</p>
Support for inclusion of Strathfillan and West Glen Dochart, with the boundary drawn to include the water catchment to the east	B/0038	B/0090	A/0152	3	<p>One of the reasons visitors come to Loch Dochart is to climb our "munros" if the point at which they leave their transport is to be in the Park, then so should the "munro" they wish to climb. We suggest that the northern boundary of the Park should follow the watershed round the Loch Dochart Estate march and progress eastwards until it follows the Allt Riobain southwards to the main road. This would fit in with your desire to find a boundary between Strathfillan and Lower Glen Dochart. Also it would lead southwards to the Allt Corrie Choarach, which would allow the Boundary to enter Balquhidder Glen at an appropriate point. (B/0038)</p>
Support for exclusion of Strathfillan and West Glen Dochart	A/0174, A/0185, A/0199, B/0117, C/0142, C/0187, D/0172, D/0351, H/0145, J/0095	C/0159	A/0033, A/0057, A/0066, A/0134, A/0204, A/0207, A/0249, C/0175, C/0227, E/0250, G/0126, F/0034, J/0194, O/0224, O/0309	26	<p>No to Strathfillan (13). Yes to Glen Falloch + West Glen Dochart (12). (A/0204)</p> <p>Crianlarich stands on the A84 corridor at the junction with the A82 which passes through the Loch Lomond core area. However, Crianlarich is functionally largely concerned with the road junction, the traffic to and from the northwest and is a base for a surrounding mountain area, which is not included within the core area. It may loosely be referred to as a "gateway" to Loch Lomond, but this is a function which could be better served at Ardlui. (A/0207)</p> <p>Stirling Council does not support the inclusion of Strathfillan and West Glen</p>

				<p>Dochart, at present, although there is a strong "common sense" case for aligning the Park and Council boundaries in the north of the area. (E/0250)</p> <p>We...do not want to be in the National Park. (majority vote) We do not feel that our area fulfills the criteria laid down in the legislation for inclusion in the Park. a) our historical and cultural history is not linked to Loch Lomond. Our identity, which has been hard won, is that of Breadalbane - 'High Scotland'. Breadalbane's history is linked with St Fillan, Robert the Bruce, his battles and escapes, including links with Stirling and Bannockburn, the Campbells of Glen Orchy and later the Campbells of Brealbane. Their links to Finlarig Castle in Killin and later their acquisitions on Loch Tay and Taymouth Castle at Kenmore. The Glen is home to McNabs and McGregors whose associations are more with the Tay than Loch Lomond. Inclusion in the Loch Lomond National Park would result in the loss of our local identity, linked to our history and Breadalbane. b) our geography and topography is Highland. Our needs are different to those seen as priorities for the low-lying areas around Loch Lomond. Our watershed is west to the Atlantic and East into the Tay System - not south to Loch Lomond. c) Loch Lomond has unique needs, aspirations and problems associated mainly with its proximity to the Central Lowlands and the large centres of population. It has a recognizable core identity associated with a linked to the Loch. It suffers heavy use / abuse by its proximity to Glasgow and its desirability as a commuter district. Our Glen has no commonality with these problems other than erosion problems caused by the use of the long distance footpath, (West Highland Way), which passes through part of our glen. d) The proposed plan 'divides' our historical, social and economic community, which is linked, to Killin and the glen as a whole. (H/0145)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Question 5: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of East Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for the exclusion of East Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay	A/0016, A/0138, A/0199, A/0255, A/0319, A/039, B/0027, C/0187, D/0171, D/0172, D/0326, D/0351, E0299, E/0122, H/0261, J/0095, O/0097, P/0292	A/0128, K/0232	A/0009, A/0010, A/0033, A/0066, A/0043, A/0057, A/0092 A/0204, A/0249, A/0134, A/0207 A/0220, C/0120, C/0175, C/0226, C/0227 E/0250, F/0034, G/0126 J/0194, K/0129, K/0163, K/0284, K/0298, K/0311, L/0100, L/0271, M/0048, N/0243, N/0300, N/0323, N/0332, O/0078, O/0224, O/0270, O/0293, O/0309	57	<p>The pale yellow area to the east is questionable. If it is ultimately decided to include any part of it the northern limit should be the skyline north of the road A85. Glen Lochay is not considered relevant to the NP. (A/0092)</p> <p>Moving towards Killin and northwards from Glen Dochart the landscape changes, becoming more open and akin to the Grampian mountains. The initial feeling is that this area should be excluded. In addition, Killin is more associated with Loch Tay and the Grampians and does not fit well with the concept of a gateway settlement to the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park. It is recommended therefore, that this area be excluded. (E/0122)</p> <p>In terms of landscape, the area does not share the distinctive character of the core area. There is no intimate mix of mountains, woodland and water, and the area is characterised by a more broad upland mountain landscape, typical of Breadalbane and the areas to the East. (H/0261)</p> <p>East Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay should be excluded from the proposed National Park. The reasons for this are similar to those above and will limit the involvement of local authority areas with little or no association within Loch Lomond & the Trossachs, these areas are essentially 'Breadalbane' in nature, both geological and botanical. (J/0194)</p> <p>East Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay are quite different in character to the core area of the National Park and naturally look east to Loch Tay. Inclusion would provide limited additional benefits to nature conservation and we agree to their exclusion. (K/0311)</p>

<p>Support for the inclusion of East Glen Dochart</p>	<p>A/0102, A/0104, A/0138, A/0170, A/0191, D/0110, D/0123, D/0225, D/0277, D/0316, H/0145, O/0127, P/0292</p>	<p>A/0036, A/0281, B/0027, D/0056, K/0232, L/0103</p>	<p>A/0039, A/0040, A/0043, A/0051, A/0152, A/0220, C/0063, C/0120, F/0072, G/0228, G/0336, H/0069, H/0195, H/0248, H/0314, H0340, K/0163, K/0212, K/0290, K/0318, L/0218, L/0229, L/0296, L/0308</p>	<p>43</p>	<p>Given the strong links between Tyndrum, Crianlarich and communities further east, there is also a case for including a part of Breadalbane within the park. (A/0115)</p> <p>Keep the whole of Glen Dochart within the Park, but whatever happens for this area, the Glen should not be cut in half and the watershed on the north side of the A85 would provide a sensible boundary. (A/0220)</p> <p>This is an important eastern gateway. There are cultural links with McLaren High School community. The whole of Glen Dochart should be included. Killin is part of the larger community of the Trossachs. (D/0225)</p> <p>It appears to be the desire of the majority of the community to be included in the NP area. The following are some of the reasons given for supporting this desire: (a) It is felt the benefits could be gained by inclusion of the area within the NP area. The area is a popular centre for all types of tourists, with a good proportion of hill walkers and fishermen. If the area was within the NP it may be better placed to regulate these activities. (b) The area is one of outstanding scenic beauty. It contains amongst other things, 2 rivers, (Dochart and Lochay) plus the Falls of Dochart, Loch Tay, the Breadalbane Folklore Centre, and numerous opportunities for hill walking, to name just a few of its attractions. (c) Killin village is the main centre for the north west area of Stirling. Medical, Ambulance, Fire and Road services are all located in the village. It also contains numerous hotels, restaurants and shops, as well as garage and other services. (d) It is situated on the main route from the east, the A827 which connects the A9 Ballingluig to the A85 at Lix Toll. Therefore, it must surely be recognised as a gateway to the NP, and therefore be included in the NP. (e) In the document, page 19, para 3.18, it states that this area is "perceived as part of a different landscape to Loch Lomond etc." This is arguable, as the area, as has already been stated at (b) above, has many of the features common to Loch Lomond. It should also be noted that this area's affinity is primarily with the Stirling direction, and not to the east as has been suggested in some quarters. For example all services to the area emanate from the Stirling direction. Secondary schools, hospital, postal and most supply services come from that area. Very little services are supplied from the east (Aberfeldy) direction, which</p>
---	---	---	--	-----------	---

				<p>after all is a different Council area. (f) Whilst we have no desire, and feel that it is not in our remit to deny the residents in the Argyll Forest Park area their desire to be within the NP area, we do feel it is grossly unjust that an area like our own should be left out of the NP. We would argue strongly that this area has more in common with the Loch Lomond area than the Argyll Forest area. It is also felt that as the majority of our services come from the Callander area, plus the fact that it is also a gateway to the proposed NP, we feel it should also be included in the NP if that is the wish of the Callander community. The fact that many visitors from the central belt do a circular trip, by way of Loch Lomond, Crianlarich, Callander, many calling at Killin (only two miles off their route) to visit the Falls of Dochart, have refreshments or make purchases, all adding to the area's economy. It would therefore appear sensible to us, that areas 12 and 13 (Map 3, page 37) should also be included in the NP. (D/0056)</p> <p>HS has previously noted that there are important cultural heritage remains of the early medieval period (from the 9th to 14th centuries at least), in particular those associated with the cult of St Fillan and the important cultural route running from Tyndrum to Killin and probably eastwards to St Fillans itself. For this reason, we consider that this area should be considered as a single unit in terms of the cultural heritage. We continue to support the inclusion of the whole area on this basis, and consider that this cultural route would present the Park Authority with a unique opportunity to identify, conserve and interpret a significant historic landscape with major cultural associations. Without National Park status the area is unlikely to be managed as a single entity nor to be subject to any major interpretative effort. (G/0336)</p> <p>If Killin is included and I suggest there are strong reasons for doing so then Ardeonaig must be too. It is part of the same community - the same Community Council, the same Parish Church, Ardeonaig children attend primary school in Killin, economic links are with Killin. The local enterprise company is the same - Forth Valley Enterprise. (K/0232)</p> <p>It is our view that this area should be included in total in the National Park. It has always been part of Perthshire and for the last 25 years part of Stirling</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>District. All transport, school and economic links are directed towards Callander and Stirling. Killin is the largest area of population north of Callander with many attractions for the visitor. The area does have heavy visitor pressures in the summer not just from hillwalkers but also from fishermen and increasingly with cyclists using the new cycle route.</p> <p>Tyndrum makes an ideal northern gateway with the merging of the A82 and A85 between Tyndrum and Crianlarich. The area has an important heritage as a main drovers route to the south. It is our view that the Tarmachan range north of Killin is the ideal boundary for the northern edge of the park. The Lawers area is adequately protected by the National Trust for Scotland.(L/0103)</p>
Support for inclusion of Glen Lochay.	A/0102, A/0173, A/0174 , A/0278, K0094	B/0090	A/0189, A/0328, H/0195, K/0231	10	<p>There is a case for inclusion of Glen Lochay within the park. This follows a logical progression through cumulative inclusion of Strathfillan, West Glen dochart (and Killin) and then Glen Lochay. The potential boundary, as requested for consultation, along the West Highland Line, only comes into focus if Glen Lochay is excluded. (B/0090)</p> <p>One reason for supporting most of this "yellow area" being within the National Park, is that if left out it will become a far flung, separated area of the Stirling Council area and as such is unlikely to receive the protection that the area deserves. (K/0094)</p>

Question 6: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for the inclusion of Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich	A/0016, A/0053, A/0081, A/0102, A/0138, A/0245, A/0166, A/0191 A/039, D/0099, D/0123 D/0148, D/0225, K/0180, M/0282, O/0080, O/0127		A/0010, A/0040, A/0043, A/0059, A/0152, A/0168, A/0220, A/0249, A/0341, A/0328, C/0063, C/0120, E/0266, E/0299, F/0268, G/0228, G/0336, H/0340, K/0231, K/0290, K/0298, L/0100, L/0130, L/0218, L/0229, L/0271, L/0296, L/0308, L/0322, L/0325, L/0348, O/0114, O/0270, O/0309	51	<p>Stuc a'Chroin and Ben Vorlich should be included as they are such an important part of the Highland Fault line and give that "barrier" feeling with all delights that lay beyond. To leave out these two eastern "sentinels", which have played such a part in the history and culture of the Trossachs, would be unthinkable.(A/0102)</p> <p>There are established water sports facilities on Loch Earn but it will be important to stave off pressures for such activity on the smaller and much less suitable Lochs Lubnaig and Voil. It may be easier to do this if all three principal water bodies in this northeast corner of the National Park are under the Park Authority's aegis. Area 9. Ben Vorlich is one of the most popular hills in Southern Highlands and path erosion is a major problem. While repair work is at present being carried out under other auspices, regular maintenance in the long-term might better assured through guaranteed National Park funding. (A/0166)</p> <p>So my main point is that, as someone in Lochearnhead, please <u>include us in!!!</u> The National park designation and the resulting management improvements I think will benefit the area greatly, not just for the locals, but for all the people who come up from Edinburgh and Glasgow to enjoy the hills and the loch. We are as much a unique and beautiful part of Scotland as the whole rest of the proposed park, and the area needs and deserves the status of National Park in my view. (A/0245)</p> <p>We were alarmed to hear of the decision by the Interim Committee to exclude Loch Earn and St Fillans from the proposed Park and we urge you to emphasise the difficulties of "policing" the water if this becomes a reality. In our opinion it will be a recipe for disaster as too many anomalies of responsibilities will occur. The reason given, we understand, is that it would save bringing a further Authority into the picture, but we understand that Perth and Kinross Council are keen to get involved.(D/0148)</p>

				<p>HS has previously argued that Loch Earn and its immediate environs should be included in the proposed Park because of its associations with the routeway mentioned above and for its other important remains, including medieval and later settlements and the crannogs in the loch itself. Further north, however, this cultural heritage could be argued to have closer affinities to Perthshire. (G/0336)</p> <p>sportscotland considers that by including the whole of the loch within the National Park, such problems will be overcome and an holistic approach to the management of the Loch can be taken. sportscotland does not adhere to the view that the loch should be split simply to exclude Perth and Kinross Council from the Park. Furthermore, while sportscotland acknowledges that the intensity of use on the Loch may occur to the west, use ranges over the whole of the loch requiring management of the loch as a complete entity. sportscotland fears that if Loch Earn is excluded from the Park and management is only possible through the Local Authority, it will not have the time or resources to secure the best future for the Loch. A national park should provide the consideration and resources necessary to ensure a more positive and sustainable form of management for Loch Earn. (G/0228)</p> <p>LINK's members are generally of the view that Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich should be included, and that the boundary should not be influenced by Council areas, but by the natural/land management issues relevant to a National Park. Moreover, there is a significant view that the inclusion of land within Perth and Kinross Council may be a benefit. (K/0231)</p> <p>The majority of our members see distinct advantages of being in the Park. Balquhider and Strathyre are in the designated area but Lochearnhead, Loch Earn and St Fillans are in the "second wave". We think that Lochearnhead, Loch Earn and St Fillans should be in, particularly as a means of extending controls on water usage if problems are exported from Loch Lomond and for example an invasion takes place of power boats and jet-bikes occurs on Loch Earn. The benefits of a well funded Ranger service on Lochs Lubnaig, Voil, Doine and Earn would be very welcome as a means of educating and influencing the current mis-users of our foreshores. (M/0282)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Glen Ogle, Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich also make a complete region which merges well into the core areas of Balquidder and Trossachs with which they have historical, cultural and communication links.(O/0127)
Support for the inclusion of Ben Vorlich but not Loch Earn	A/0278, D/0110, D/0171, D/0225, H/0261, K/0094,		A/0092, C/0061, C/0120, E/0250, G/0126, K/0165, K/0163, K/0284	14	<p>I do not consider that the planning/management issues justify the inclusion of any part of the local authority of Perth and Kinross which would unnecessarily burden the administration and operation of the Park by the inclusion of a fourth authority. I favour the Park boundaries lying along the local authority boundaries and relying on joint management of the loch between the Park authority and the local authority. The boundary of the Park should be that of the watershed of Ben Vorlich, a very appropriate landmark mountain. (A/0278)</p> <p>We can see a strong case to include Locheearnhead in the National Park but we can see no valid reason for assuming that the whole of Loch Earn should be included. There is no road linking Callander with St. Fillans and the boundaries proposed seem fairly arbitrary. Could this boundary not be set along the county boundary? Certainly this would exclude Ben Vorlich but still leave easy access. The village of Locheearnhead has a number of sporting and cultural links particularly with the Trossachs. However, our concern with keeping the boundary to the core initially, applies. (D/0171)</p> <p>The inclusion of the Ben Vorlich area can be justified in that it is homogeneous with the area to the west and under considerable pressures, however the Council cannot support the added complication of the Park containing a small part of the area administered by Perth & Kinross Council. The benefits of including all of this area would be outweighed by the complications of having the designated area encroaching on another</p>

					administrative region. The inclusion of this area should be re-examined following monitoring and then restricted to the Council's boundary. Loch Earn should be excluded because there are alternative management options, which could be developed. (E/0250)
Support for the exclusion of Ben Vorlich and Loch Earn	A/0068, A/0098, A/0174, A/0185, A/0199, A/0255, A/0319, B/0044 B/0125, B/0211, B/0234 , B/0286, B/0287, B/0288, C/0187, D/0172, D/0225, D/0326, D/0351, K/0094, J/0095, O/0097	C/0159 D/0320	A/0009, A/0033, A/0039 A/0057, A/0066, A/0092 A/0134, A/0160 A/0189, B/0310, C/0175, E/0122, F/0034, H/0195, J/0194, K/0311, L/0067, N/0263 N/0332, O/0078 O/0224	45	<p>While there is an argument for including Loch Earn and the east side of Ben Vorlich in the Park because of a likely increase in recreational activity, this is outweighed by the greatly increased authorities represented on it. The management of the east end of the loch could be achieved by collaborative working between the NPA and Perth and Kinross Council. (A/0189)</p> <p>This area should not be included, as it would involve another local authority. Loch Earn's problems could be addressed by a management arrangement within the Park Authority. (A/0174)</p> <p>Ben Vorlich and Stuc a'Chroin geographically lie in Glenartney. The proposed park boundary cuts across the Estate march and divides both the Glenartney Deer management Group and the historic Royal Deer Forest. We are concerned that the National Park designation will increase visitor pressure, making it difficult for the Deer Management Group to achieve its objectives. The Fort at Dundurn is now in the ownership of a Registered Charity which is committed to conserving a number of SSSIs, historic buildings and ancient monuments within Perthshire. It is questionable whether it is appropriate for this one site to be included within the National Park. (B/0310)</p> <p>Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich should be excluded. If they were in the area, another local authority would be involved. An arrangement could be made with it to control water activities on Loch Earn. (D/0172)</p> <p>On paragraph 3-21, we are of the view that Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich should not be in the National Park because they are well beyond the watershed boundary of the Trossachs. They have strong affinities with Perthshire and the towns and villages to the East. Loch Earn and Ben</p>

				<p>Vorlich should become a Regional Park along with the River Earn National Scenic Area and Glen Artney.(D/0320)</p> <p>Whilst there are physical similarities with the landscape of the core area, this extension would go well beyond what is recognised as the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs area and, in particular, bring in a fourth Local Council. This has implications in terms of representation on the National Park Authority Board and also brings a fourth structure plan into play. Understandably, there are concerns about management of water activities on Loch Earn and concerns that pressures may grow if the Loch remains just outside the National Park. However, as indicated in paragraph 3.2 of the consultation document, the issues relating to Loch Earn can be managed jointly by the appropriate Local Authority and the National Park Authority operating outwith its area. The recommendation would therefore be that this area be excluded from the National Park. St Fillans is not an appropriate gateway settlement, both in terms of its own appearance or its landscape setting.(E/0122)</p> <p>It is particularly problematic to set a boundary across water, and we appreciate the difficulties created by splitting Loch Earn in line with the current administrative boundaries. However, the area to the east has few cultural and landscape connections with the remainder of the National Park, while St Fillans, in common with the excluded River Earn National Scenic Area, has, in general, a greater cohesion with central Perthshire communities in Lochearnhead and St Fillans do have some links. Lochearnhead has in contrast strong ties with the core area and should be included. Separate management arrangements for Loch Earn would be our preferred option for this area. The mountainous area to the south of Loch Earn, including Ben Vorlich and Stuc a Chroin, is fairly isolated from the other upland areas of the Park and does not have strong links with the core area. It should, therefore, be excluded. (H/0195)</p> <p>Loch Earn and Ben Vorlich should not be included in the proposed National Park. Although this area may be considered to have a strong case for inclusion, the SLF considers that it is too distant from Loch Lomond to have any direct association that may bring economic or social benefit. Environmental concerns are already addressed by natural heritage</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					designations, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). (J/0194)
--	--	--	--	--	--

Question 7: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of Flanders Moss

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for the exclusion of Flanders Moss	A/0014, A/0016, A/0068, A/0098, A/0102, A/0138, A/0174, A/0199, A/0255, A/0280, A/0319, D/0171, D/0225, H/0261, K/0094, J/0095, O/0097	L/0103	A/0009, A/0033, A/0043, A/0057, A/0066, A/0092, A/0168, A/0207, A/0220, A/0249, A/0328, C/0061, C/0063, C/0120, C/0227, E/0122, E/0250, F/0034, H/0069, H/0195, H/0314, J/0233) L/0067, L/0348, O/0309	43	<p>Flanders Moss and the Lake of Menteith are already well protected and do not suffer high visitor pressure, although Inchmahome Island is historically important, inclusion should be a matter for local residents to decide. (A/0102)</p> <p>I was surprised by the omission of the Flanders Moss Area, but on reviewing the criteria, agree with its omission from the area and hope that its protection orders from the earlier acts of drainage and planting are now firmly in place. (A/0280)</p> <p>Flanders Moss is quite distinct in character from the proposed National Park area and is more logically connected with the Carse of Stirling than with the upland area to the north and west. As the local community is opposed to its inclusion, there would seem little point in imposing National Park status.(C/0063)</p> <p>We see no advantage in including Flanders Moss as it does not conform to the theme of Mountain, Loch and Forest though it may be of international importance as an SSSI. (D/0171)</p> <p>This area is in the lowlands, beyond the highland boundary fault and whilst there may be cultural links it does not form a cohesive part of the main Loch Lomond and the Trossachs area. It should not, therefore, be included within the Park. (E/0122)</p> <p>Flanders Moss however, is an extensive, lowland agricultural area, which has more in common with the Carse of Stirling than Loch Lomond and the Trossachs.Flanders Moss does not experience significant recreational pressures, and does not require enhanced visitor management, although the archaeological interest could provide additional opportunities for interpretation. The involvement of the National Park in this area would</p>

					<p>appear to be less of a necessity. (H/0261)</p> <p>The Union is obliged to conclude that, with the exception of strong feelings against, in the area of Flanders Moss and the agricultural land around Loch Ruskie and Thornhill, Lake of Menteith, and Strathendrick and Strathblane, members are not much exercised on the subject of the boundary.(J/0233)</p> <p>Flanders Moss presents a difficult choice because of its exceptional ecological and conservation importance. Flanders Moss East is the largest single area of not too damaged raised mire left in all Britain and peat cores taken from various parts of the mire have led to informative pollen and macrofoil analyses linked to radiocarbon dating and to numerous archaeological remains. There have also been very thorough geomorphological investigations on the Late Quaternary sediments of the area. However, geographically and ecologically it is difficult to see the area as part of the Loch Lomond/Trossachs and would enlarge the Park considerably into an area of a very different character. So long as its integrity is adequately protected by other designations (and the Moss is already an important Special Area of Conservation (SAC)), the Society believes that there is less justification for including it in the National Park.(O/0309)</p>
Support for the inclusion of part of the area	O/0097		G/0126	2	We would suggest that the Park boundary in this area include the area around the Lake of Menteith as well as the young woodlands to the west of Flanders Moss, the east of the A81 and the north of the B835.(G/0126)
Support for the inclusion of Flanders Moss	D/0225, D/0351, K/0180, O/0127	B/0136	A/0010, A/0039, A/0040, A/0152, A/0189, A/0204, E/0299, G/0126, G/0336, K/0163, K/0257, K/0294, L/0135, L/0218	19	Flanders Moss is as mentioned important as a Special Area for Conservation but its vicinity could deteriorate seriously if it is not subjected to very careful planning control. There is no reason why any development in sub-areas 14 and 20 should not be expected to be of similar quality to anything allowed elsewhere in the sub-areas depicted in Map 3. Indeed a decline in standards in sub-area 20 could well lead to increased pressure on areas to the north. Consequently, if it is thought that Strathendrick and Strathblane do not qualify for inclusion in a National Park, that decision should be accompanied by measures to ensure that a degree of planning control is applied to them similar to what might be expected in a National Park, with substantially similar policies.(A/0152)

				<p>Flanders Moss is an integral part of an outstanding area of natural and cultural heritage embraced by the area shown in yellow in Map 2, north of the A 811. The character of the Trossachs is quite different to the character of Loch Lomond, and so to say that Flanders Moss "can scarcely be associated" with their character(s) lacks force as an argument. The Moss is an outstanding heritage asset, providing, with the Lake of Menteith, the setting for the east of Ben Lomond and the Trossachs, and with improved and enlightened management to deforest, enhance and restore the Moss which is more likely to come with designation as a National Park than by other means, its inclusion is entirely warranted. Therefore, Flanders Moss should be included in the National Park (A/0189)</p> <p>Our view is that Flanders Moss, as one of the area's principal nature conservation and landscape features should be included within the park boundary. We therefore do not agree with the conclusions contained in the report regarding this site, and note that at least two of the specialist reporting groups agreed with our view. Moreover, we do not agree with the report's statement that the "special management needs of these interests is a weakness (<i>sic</i>). Rather, we suggest that if an area does have special management needs for cultural, landscape or nature conservation reasons, then that is precisely why such areas should be included within a National Park! (B/0136)</p> <p>The Lake of Menteith and Flanders Moss have strong historical, community and cultural connections with the Aberfoyle area. The landscape of the area is similar to the gentler countryside of the Aberfoyle and Callander areas. These areas should be included given the nature conservation importance of Flanders Moss and the differing but connected landscape variety which these areas would add to the park.(E/0299)</p> <p>We have previously noted the richness of Flanders Moss for its cultural heritage and potential for palaeoenvironmental evidence. It is a highly important area which would benefit from the active conservation management that would be expected from the Park Authority. While the area lies within a National Nature Reserve, the focus of this is clearly on the natural heritage whereas the park Authority should give equal weight to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>cultural heritage interests. It would also provide the park with an opportunity for education and interpretation of the cultural heritage which is not available elsewhere within the proposed area.(G/0336)</p> <p>The BSS is strongly in favour of the inclusion within the proposed National Park of the area Southeast of the proposed boundary and shown in yellow on Map 2.It is believed that by this extension the conservation of two important areas would be enhanced. Flanders Moss and other raised bogs in its vicinity are relatively undamaged examples of their type. They display the flora typical of the habitat while, underground, conserving palaeobotanical evidence of past vegetation and climate. b) The Northern and Western regions of the Campsie Fells support a number of uncommon plants on their base rich rocks. The populations of <i>Epilobium alsinifolium</i>, <i>Minuartia verna</i> and <i>Potentilla neumanniara</i> and might be better protected were they to exist within the bounds of a National Park. (K/0294)</p> <p>There was less certainty regarding the Flanders Moss area but general agreement was reached that this area should be included as the area exhibits those special qualities that reflect the uniqueness of the National Park proposal. The opportunities in this area for recreation are significant, and members were concerned about excessive and inappropriate development implications that might arise if the area was not included in the boundary of the National Park (Although this situation might be true of any area on the fringes of the Park's boundary). (L/0218)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Question 8: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of the Lake of Menteith					
Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for inclusion of the Lake of Menteith	A/0016, A/0138, A/0199, C/0187, D/0110, D/0225, D/0351, K/0094, K/0180, J/0095, O/0097, O/0127		A/0010, A/0040, A/0043 A/0057, A/0059, A/0092, A/0134, A/0168, A/0189, A/0204, A/0220, A/0249, A/0328, A/0341, C/0061, C/0175, C/0227, E/0122, E/0299, G/0126, G/0228, G/0336, H/0195, K/0163, K/0231, K/0284, K/0290, K/0298, K/0311, L/0100, L/0130, L/0218, L/0229, L/0308, L/0322, O/0078, O/0114 O/0270, O/0309	51	<p>... I would include the area around the Lake of Menteith, even although it is of a lowland character. (A/0057)</p> <p>I am in favour of including The Lake of Menteith but do respect that a majority of those who work and live in that area are against inclusion. (C/0187)</p> <p>Although the Lake of Menteith is also within the lowland area, it has strong cultural links with the Trossachs. Although it is in the lowlands it has a highland feel to it and historical importance and can be seen to be physically part of the Trossachs area. It addition does little to the overall size of the Park and it is recommended that it be included. (E/0122)</p> <p>sportscotland considers that the Lake of Menteith should be included within the boundary of the National Park. The Lake is of significant importance for angling purposes and is a well used resource. There is perhaps potential to increase the range of recreational activities on the Lake which, it is felt, could be properly addressed by the National Park. Related to this, would be the need for its inclusion in any integrated approach to watersport management in the Park. (G/0228)</p> <p>HS welcomes the inclusion of Inchmahome Priory, which is the only Property in Care in the proposed area. This monument, which currently attracts many visitors in its own right, would fit well into a wider visitor network for the Park area and HS would be happy to work with the Park Authority on a wider visitor management strategy. The area is also rich in a wide range of other cultural heritage attributes. (G/0336)</p> <p>The Lake of Menteith, lying as it does immediately at the foot of the Highland Fault and receiving water from the same hills, is an integral part of the Trossachs and should be included. (K/0311)</p>

					<p>The Lake of Menteith itself however is a major angling resource and, as a rainbow trout fishery, it is second in importance only to Loch Leven and we believe must be included. (L0322)</p> <p>The Lake of Menteith should be included within the National Park, for both conservation, cultural and recreational reasons, along the lines argued in our answer to question 7. An attempt to walk around the Lake, with its non-existent footpath, points to one very good reason why National Park status is needed. (L/0308)</p> <p>Lake of Menteith should be included being unique, of great historical interest and closely appended to the main body of the park. (J/0095)</p> <p>The Society agrees that the Lake of Menteith and its woods, with their importance for biodiversity, link well to the Trossachs and should be included in the Park. (O0309)</p>
Support for the Exclusion of the Lake of Menteith	A0068, A/0098, A/0185, A/0199, B/0262, B/0286, D/0171, D/0225 H/0261, K/0316	D/0320 B/0177	A/0033, A/0039, A/0066, A/0207, C/0063, E/0250, F/0034, K/0150, J/0194, J/0233, L/0067, M/0048, N/0263	25	<p>The Lake of Menteith has its own beauty but is not linked visually or functionally with Loch Lomond. (A/0207)</p> <p>There appears to be no good reason to single out the Lake for inclusion in a Park other than at the behest of certain public bodies. Unlike individuals who live and work there, those organisations will not be adversely affected in any personal way indeed they see designation as a gateway to obtaining funds for their operations.....The majority of those locally involved with the land are content with the status quo and do not consider that there is any special need in this area. The great asset is that it is a tranquil district largely by-passed by those seeking the Trossachs proper. To include the area in a National Park would lead to the eventual destruction of that asset. Furthermore the cultural heritage, Inchmahome et al, is already under the management of Historic Scotland. The Natural Heritage of both land and water has long been recognised by those who live around the Lake. The Fishery has been co-operatively managed for the good of the Lake and its</p>

				<p>environs for many years. The Lake and much of its surrounds and designated SSSI and are thus controlled by SNH. The public forest is controlled by the Forestry Authority and the water by SEPA. To add a designation of National Park can be seen to be quite unnecessaryInclusion in the Park would lead to increased visitor pressure threatening the natural heritage and adding to the difficulties of those farming in the area. Bureaucratic control would be further increased. In short there appears to be no benefit to be gained for the Loch Lomond and Trossachs Park by including this area. (B/0262)</p> <p>The Lake of Menteith is already adequately protected by other designations and is not considered to be at risk. It would therefore appear that this area does not meet the criteria for inclusion within any National Park. (B/0286)</p> <p>As far as the Port of Menteith is concerned we understand that the majority of the residents do not wish to be a part of a National Park but the road link through the village itself is important. (D/0171)</p> <p>Stirling Council does not agree that the Lake of Menteith should be included, as the needs of this area are adequately met by current arrangements and designation would not bring any immediate benefits to this area. (E/0250)</p> <p>The case for the Upper Forth drainage areas is, by the same token, less well made. Since it has been virtually agreed to include the Trossachs, (which do belong to the Forth drainage), this means that exclusion has to draw a line somewhere between the mountainous upper Forth, and the distinctive flat lands of the middle carse. In other words, the Park may be regarded as one which binds together the mountains and lochs of the west coast. On this basis, the line would exclude the Lake Menteith area, and the Callander area. (K/0150)</p> <p>Similarly, Lake of Menteith is quite different in character from the lochs to the north and if the local people are opposed to its inclusion, there is little basis for including it. The A81 forms a suitable boundary on the south side of the Menteith hills. (C/0063)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The Lake of Menteith and its surrounding area should not be included in the proposed National Park area. In many ways, this area shares the same characteristics of, and is more directly associated with, Flanders Moss. It is a peripheral area in the context of Loch Lomond & the Trossachs and is already the subject of a complex SSSI. (J/0194)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Question 9: Views on the inclusion or exclusion of Strath Endrick and Strath Blane

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for exclusion of Strath Endrick and Strath Blane	A/0014, A/0016, A/0068, A/0098, A/0102, A/0138, A/0174, A/0191, A/0199, A/0255, A/0278, A/0319, C/0187, D/0171, D/0172, D/0326, D/0351, H/0261, K/0094, J/0095	A/0353, L/0103	A/0033, A/0039, A/0040, A/0043, A/0051, A/0057, A/0066, A/0092, A/0134, A/0168, A/0189, A/0204, A/0207, A/0220, A/0249, C/0061, C/0063, C/0120, C/0175, C/0226, C/0227, C/0291, E/0122, E/0250, E/0299, F/0034, G/0228 G/0336, H/0069, H/0078, H/0195, H/0248, H/0314, H/0338, J/0194, J/0233, K/0163, K/0284, K/0298, K/0318, L/0100, L/0229, M/0048, N/0300, N/0332, O/0293, O/0309	69	<p>The Strathblane and Strathendrick areas do not conform to the identity of the National Park being commuter towns and villages for those who work in the Strathclyde and the Glasgow area. (A/0102)</p> <p>Ideally the Endrick catchment area should, from an ecological point of view, be in the Park. However the demographic problem would skew the Park representative structure and possibly outweighs the ideal boundary. I would not therefore be in favour of Strathendrick and Strathblane being within the Park. (A/0191)</p> <p>I would not be in favour of the inclusion of other parts of Strathendrick. It should be possible to control the quality of the Endrick without extending the boundary of the Park in this way and including inappropriate villages and countryside. (A/0278)</p> <p>Similarly the areas based on the villages of Killearn, Balfron, Fintry, Kippen and Thornhill should not be included. Again these areas should be assisted by the creation of a different type and style of body to deal with the needs and requirements of the localities. (C/0187)</p> <p>Strathendrick and Strathblane are quite distinct in character from the area to the north, and have different development pressures and management needs. Despite the support of local people and the importance of the catchment area to Loch Lomond, I consider that most of this area should not be included. (C/0063)</p> <p>Again, the character of this area is quite distinct from the core area and it does not appear to meet the conditions for inclusion. However, its exclusion places an added importance on ensuring the ongoing high quality of the water in this key catchment area for Loch Lomond through the Catchment Management Plan. There is also a need to ensure that the area is properly managed and developed under separate arrangements to ensure that the</p>

				<p>approach to the National Park through this key corridor shares many of the quality standards expected within the Park. (H/0195)</p> <p>Any arguments about water catchment can be catered for in the context of the Loch Lomond Catchment Management Plan. These areas are more linked to the commuter belt around Glasgow and recreational opportunities, for example in the Campsie Fells. They should not be included within the Park. (E/0122)</p> <p>It is considered these areas are significantly different from the core areas of the park both in landscape appearance and in the socio-economic/employment profile of the inhabitants. The area represents a transitional zone from the intensively managed land adjacent to the conurbation to the wilder land of the core park area. The area may however benefit from developments which support the aims of the park eg accommodation and service centres for those visiting the park. Close consultation would be required between the park authority and local authority over this area if not included within the finalised boundaries of the park. (E/0299)</p> <p>We understand the logic in including whole catchments within the National park area but feel the development of the Catchment Plan for Loch Lomond will address many of the issues relating to water quality and quantity on the Endrick. In addition the Management Scheme for the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) on the Endrick will complement work in this area. We agree that the Strathendrick area does not merit inclusion within the National Park. (H/0338)</p> <p>The majority view within SORN was that on a recreational basis, the south eastern yellow area indicated on the proposal map should be excluded from the National Park. SORN considers that there is no recreation of national importance in this area and that the area has no special needs requiring National park designation. Members recognised the importance of the River Endrick for angling but felt that existing mechanisms would effectively protect and manage the River for the benefit of angling interests. (L0229)</p> <p>We strongly support the exclusion of these areas. As indicated previously, a</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>single issue such as the water quality of the River Endrick supplying Loch Lomond is not adequate in itself to justify inclusion in the light of the three statutory conditions. Conversely, the exclusion of this area does not preclude special measures being taken for the sake of the water quality of Loch Lomond. (N/0332)</p> <p>The case for exclusion of Strath Endrick and Strath Blane (the Endrick catchment) seem heavily contingent on other measures for the conservation and management of this area being put in place. Before making a decision on this area, it would be important to see progress on the idea of a Regional Park. (O/0078)</p> <p>Strath Endrick and Strath Blane are both areas with higher populations and more intensive agriculture that would be out of keeping with the general atmosphere of the Park. (O/0293)</p>
Support for the inclusion of Strath Endrick and Strath Blane	A/0185, D/0225, K/0052	A/0087, B/0026, D/0091, D/0320	A/0010, A/0032, A/0011, A/0152, A/0328, E/0313, K/0150, K/0231, K/0257, K0290, K/0294, K/0311, L/0218, L/0271, L/0306, L/0308, L/0322, O/0078, O/0224, O/0270, P/0307	28	<p>Strathendrick in? It would be useful as a giving "upstream Loch Lomond" a buffer area for development without pressing on the core zone. If the core zone can be rigidly defended, then developers will move out upstream in the park, or outside altogether. SEPA's work is another good reason for inclusion.(A/0185)</p> <p>Strathendrick and Strathblane must be included in the proposed park area. This is an essential part of the catchment for Loch Lomond and the management of this catchment has important contributions to the quality of the southern end of Loch Lomond. Economically it would be beneficial to view Balfron as a gateway to the proposed park area. (A/0328)</p> <p>Strathblane Community Council is firmly of the view that it is in the best interests of the Park and the communities of Strathendrick that the boundary encompasses the whole of Strathendrick. The Endrick Valley and the Blane Valley meet the criteria set out in the bullet points in paragraphs 3-3 and 3-4. Some very fine views of Ben Lomond are to be had from Dumbrock Moor and the high ground north of Loch Ardinning down in the Blane Valley. We have already referred to Loch Lomond's split personality. The southern portion, below the Highland Boundary Fault Line is lowland with strong</p>

				<p>affinities with the natural character and identity of Strathendrick and Strathblane. (D/0320)</p> <p>The whole of the Loch Lomond watershed should have protection, which means the inclusion of the Endrick drainage basin; this basin has in any case, ecological importance which warrants its inclusion. (K/0150)</p> <p>Since integrated management within lake and river basins is widely taken to mean "integrated catchment management", it does not stand up to scrutiny that the major inflow into Loch Lomond (representing ca. 30% of the inflow and over 50% of the catchment area) should be excluded from its management regime.....The CMP will not have planning powers equivalent to those of a National Park or be under its jurisdiction, indeed it will be under the jurisdiction of another Local Authority. As a result the development land-use issues (which affect water quality) may be treated differently from those within the Park and this dichotomy may be enhanced in the future as the map of agricultural and rural development support shifts, One rule within the park and another for outside areas which nevertheless fundamentally affect the core area of the Park is hardly a good advert for the claims made on P13 of the consultation document that the National Park would be a "demonstrator of good practice" or "well placed to pioneer new initiatives".....The position that the Endrick catchment does not conform strongly to the distinctive character and identity of the core are of Loch Lomond is just plain wrong since the character of the centrepiece, ie the Loch itself, is of a part highland, part lowland loch...that is what gives it its character and includes "the transition to the gentler lowlands". In fact the exclusion of the Endrick removes a relatively large rolling lowland contribution to exactly the aims espoused in Table 2 p36. The relative contribution of the Endrick catchment to the National Park could equally be rated at 5 because it does deliver a distinctive and diversifying contribution, whereas, for example, Strathyre might be of lesser importance because it is just "more of the same" and so its relative contribution is less than the 5 allocated in the proposal document. (O/0270)</p> <p>SANA feels strongly that the Strathendrick catchment should be included since the River Endrick itself provides and important recreational opportunity</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>and together with its tributary streams is, as a spawning resource, the essential natural regeneration base which supports and ensures the sustainability of the Lomond/Leven migratory fishery. (L/0322)</p> <p>We are bemused at the southern boundary of Area 5, Strathendrick and Strathblane, which appears to stop at Carbeth Estate. We wish to argue that the boundary should be extended to include the whole of Carbeth Estate, including Carbeth Loch SSSI, Carbeth Hill and the West Highland Way. We believe there is a strong case for including a corridor along the West Highland Way right to where it emerges from Milngavie at Mugdock Park, though we will here concentrate on the arguments for including the Carbeth Estate.....The cultural significance of the Carbeth huts has long been recognised by Historic Scotland who at one point considered listing all 185 of them in order to protect them from commercial development. (P/0307)</p>
Support for inclusion of part of the Strath Endrick and Strath Blane area	A/0206, K/0094	A/0087		3	<p>I largely agree with the proposals, and agree that Strathendrick is a borderline case. However Access to the Campsie Fells. I agree that this is of 'local' importance i.e. mainly Northern Glasgow and Strathendrick, however erosion damage especially on Dumgoyne, arguably one of the most popular hills in the Central Belt., is now a serious problem and is only likely to get worse given: a) Projections for outdoor recreation activity in the future. b) The increase in the number of users if the hills were in or adjacent to a National Park. Current pedestrian/parking access provision via the Distillery is becoming increasingly dangerous given the increasing traffic load. A detailed strategy on how to address this is required in my opinion. (A/0087)</p> <p>The northern portion of the Kilpatrick Hills should be included - from the Queen's view on the Stockiemuir, north and west to include the Cameron and Gallangad Muirs. This area has several well used walkers routes with stunning views of the loch and the hills beyond. It has considerable archeological interest e.g. neolithic cairns and a Roman road; wildlife interest with wooded glens and open moorland with a good number of black grouse, peregrine and skylark; geological interest at the Whangie. In addition the people living in this area all look to the communities of Croftamie, Drymen and Gartocharn for their local services. (A/0206)</p>

					However we consider that the Pots of Gartness should be included within the National Park and indicate an area on Map 2, which we recommend be incorporated. (K/0094)
--	--	--	--	--	---

Question 10: Views on further powers that could be envisaged for the National Park Authority					
Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for general powers proposed	A/0191, C/0187, D/0351, E/0122, J/0095, K/0094, O/0127	B/0136	A/0009, A/0051, A/0092, A/0189, A/0204, A/0220, C/0120, C/0227, E/0250, E/0301, F/0235, G/0329, H/0069, H/0195, H/0314, J/0194, K/0052, K/0163, K/0208, K/0231, K/0290, K/0311, L/0218, M/0048, N/0155, N/0243, N/0300, O/0078, O/0114, O/0348	38	<p>Further Powers. Powers beyond those listed in Table 1 (page 23) are not necessary provided these are utilised in full wherever relevant and that the planning functions (para 3.34) and the other functions (para 3.35) are all exercised directly by the National Park Authority (NPA). (A/0092)</p> <p>We also support the full range of powers as set out in Table 1 of the report (pages23-24). A national park must have a range of powers in order to implement successful management policies. (B/0136)</p> <p>(West Dunbartonshire Council) does not consider that any further powers should be envisaged for the Park Authority. (E/0122)</p> <p>SEPA does not foresee the need for the Park Authority to have powers additional to those identified in Table 1. (G/0329)</p> <p>The SLF agrees with the proposals in respect of the powers that could be invested in the National Park Authority. These powers should not go beyond what is currently proposed. (J/0194)</p> <p>LINK welcomes the proposed powers as suggested by SNH. (K0231)</p>
Support for powers to offer and receive grants and to work outside the Park boundaries		D/0091	G/0186	2	<p>Members noted the summary of key scheduled powers for the National Park Authority (NPA) and were disappointed that a specific power to give grants or otherwise apply resources outwith the Park area is not among them. Not all the costs of the National Park will fall within its boundary and budget and many indirect costs will be incurred by areas on the periphery of the Park. Increased costs falling on the periphery will be accompanied by additional inequities arising from the fact that the presence of the Park, with its own separate and centrally funded budget, will result in a two tier spend and service provision within the area administered by the same local authority. (D/0091)</p> <p>It is suggested that consideration be given to inclusion of powers to: execute</p>

					works outside the park boundary (see 1995 Environment Act, Schedule 8, section 6) in order to carry out the authority's functions; and, borrow or receive grant from the European Union or other non-Treasury sources. (G/0186)
Support for reserve powers	L/0201		A/0009, K/0273	3	<p>It is always difficult to foresee future needs and therefore the important point is that the designation order should include some catch-all phrase altering the third bullet point from such additional functions as the designation order may specify to such additional powers as the Park Authority may at some future date require subject to agreement of the Scottish Executive. (A0009)</p> <p>Reserve powers should be available to the authority to cope with future activities and problems which cannot be anticipated now, as well as problems currently emerging from use of hovercraft, microlight and light aircraft." (L/0201)</p> <p>The first course of action should be for public and private bodies in the area to voluntarily follow the National Park Plan, however a reserve power to lend weight to this would be welcome. (K/0273)</p>
Support for effective bylaws and their enforcement	A/0104, A/0205, H/0261, L/0201	A0203	A/0105, H/0195, H/0347, L0335	9	<p>They must be able to introduce by laws within the area and have the means of enforcing them." (A/0105)</p> <p>Much has been said about the need to ensure that the bylaws affecting the use of Loch Lomond are strengthened. As one directly involved I can say that the requirement is for existing bylaws to be adequately enforced rather than additional bylaws being introduced. (A/0205)</p> <p>Key powers will be needed to ensure that any development will be truly sustainable; these powers must provide effective conservation of the environment and wildlife on Loch Lomond, and must enable the deterioration of the last decade or two to be reversed. The bylaws for Loch Lomond will be one of the most important instruments in achieving this and considerable strengthening of powers beyond those provided by the current bylaws will be needed. Similar but slightly varied powers may be needed for other waters in the park area, such as Loch Ard, Loch Venachar and Loch Lubnaig. In farming, bylaws to control recreational activities; we believe</p>

					<p>that "tranquil enjoyment" should be the over riding aim, and that restoring peace and tranquillity to the traditionally quiet eastern side of the Loch Lomond is particularly important." (L/0201)</p> <p>"The Interim Committee ... seek to ensure that the content of the Designation Order for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs provides for improvement in the effectiveness and efficiency of visitor management enforcement powers. (H/0261)</p> <p>Any byelaw is only as effective as its ability to be enforced. It is therefore essential that careful thought and consideration is given to how the park authority would envisage enforcing byelaws. It is not sufficient for the authority simply to rely on existing police resources, given the limited number of officers currently located within the park boundary. I would recommend early consultation with the three police forces potentially within the park boundary on the specifics of any byelaw with a view to agreeing proposals on their enforcement. (H/0347)</p>
Support for powers in respect to access and recreation			K/0294, L/0308	2	<p>Within the park area the NPA should be responsible for all the duties and powers allocated to Local Authorities under the forthcoming access legislation. (K0294)</p>
Support for powers in respect to traffic management and transport planning	A0081, A/0104, D/0277		A/0063, B/0310, L/0308, N/0332, O/0259, P/0292	9	<p>There must be adequate traffic controls within the Park, and at the moment it is almost impossible for the Police to control the Excessive speeding of visitors and locals within the villages that lie within the proposed park area, so funds must also be available to the appropriate Police forces to this end. (A/0104)</p> <p>The increase in visitor numbers will necessitate road improvements which are currently outwith the powers envisaged for the park. Close co-operation will be needed between the Roads Authorities and the National Park. In this area the A85 will require improvement between Lochearnhead and St. Fillans. This will necessitate additional land and careful planning so that the broad leaved fringe on the Loch-side is retained." (B/0310)</p> <p>We would recommend the following:- That it be clarified that the NPA will have sufficient powers to implement the consequences of Traffic Orders</p>

					<p>made by Scottish Ministers including parking provision and transport facilities, notwithstanding the retention of roads and transportation powers by the local authorities. (N/0332)</p> <p>Road Traffic Orders: powers to close roads as required for local access only. So promoting public transport or cycling (e.g. Balquidder, Inversnaid, Rowerdennan). Powers for provision of adequate parking. (P/0292)</p>
<p>Concerns about development and activities exempt from planning control (including crown exemption)</p>	<p>A/0023, A/0102, A/0106, A/0166, A/0170, A/0185, A/0260, D/0123, D/0153, D/0171, D/0225, D/0277, O/0202</p>	<p>D/0056</p>	<p>A/0051, A/0085, D/0162, F/0072, G/0329, L/0296, K/0231</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>.....if this is to be a "different park" to others in the UK and "innovative" that we seriously consider that Crown Properties such as the Forestry should be legally included in the planning process.. (A/0023)</p> <p>Its role as planning authority must include powers to prevent construction of bulldozed tracks, the erection of telecommunications masts, power lines, over ground gas, oil and water pipes. (A/0051)</p> <p>We are very strongly in favour of new legislation to bring Crown Properties under the planning requirement imposed on all other organisations. We see this as imperative if there is to be a real overall design for the future. Rights of the National Park should be paramount to manage the environment in the way the Authority see is best for all parties and to rely on goodwill of the Crown Properties as individual exemptions would not be in the best interests of the Park while it might be for them. (D/0171)</p> <p>We are very much in favour of a park planning authority but it must be sympathetic to the socio-economic needs of the Park community. It should also be empowered to deal with private and crown land applications on an equal basis - ie. Crown owned land must be subject to the same system as privately owned land. (F/0072)</p> <p>... with regard to additional powers for the Park Authority (Page 22 s3.33) there may be a case for restricting some permitted development rights that might be detrimental to the aims of the Park, as outlined earlier in the document in section 2.5 (G/0329)</p> <p>.. a particular need for legislation allowing restriction of General Permitted</p>

					<p>Development Rights in relation to vehicle tracks, road improvements, telecommunications masts, signage and road furniture, electricity and power lines, fencing etc. It is not clear from the present Consultation Paper whether such a mechanism will be available to the Park Authority, nor what form it might take, but without such powers the work of the Park will be persistently undermined. (L/0296)</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 erections. (K/0231)</p> <p>There should be no Crown Exemptions within the Park and the Water Boards should be under the Authority of the National Park Planning Board (O/0202)</p>
Support for powers in respect to land management	D/0277, K/0180, P/0292	B/0090	K/0273, K/0284, K/023, K/0344	8	<p>Similarly a number of other agencies, authorities and land managers should be stated to be expected to more than merely consult the NPA on developments outwith normal planning controls in a National Park, but to work with not against, the authority to achieve greater environmental gains as set out in the National Park Plan... A Plan that would achieve the best voluntary co-operation in this way would not be one that emphasises constraints. This principal applies particularly to agri-environmental schemes for which farmers are applying for grants to the Scottish Executive, but also to approval of Forestry Grant schemes by the Forestry Commission that may affect the landscape, leisure and recreation activity, and to Electricity Act proposals including hydro-electric schemes. Less contentious perhaps in this National Park than it will be in the Cairngorms, is the need for the Park Authority to influence land managers with clear indications in the Park Plan of where or to what extent extensive grazing by sheep or deer, burning of heather, excessive forest fencing, blanket felling or bulldozing of tracks for whatever purpose could be most or least accommodated. National Parks are being set up in Scotland with great expectations of the first one, particularly when such a large measure of consensus has been achieved through years of working by the Interim Committee and its predecessors. Wild land issues will raise the most difficult problems for the</p>

					<p>Park Authority, but it will not be helped in setting clear parameters for rural land management and control of developments outwith local authority planning if these are not referred to in SNH's final proposals. (K/0180)</p> <p>...in a sense it is the role of the National Park and the NPA in managing the other land uses within the area that is more important. Farming, forestry, conservation, deer management, sporting, fisheries and river management are all 'managed' in a wide range of ways through agreements, grants and subsidies, orders and plans by a wide range of public agencies. They do not however fall directly under the planning functions of a local authority. The primary legislation laid a duty on those public agencies 'to have regard to' the National Park Plan. The Plan must be the document that articulates the objectives for each of these areas of land use and therefore for the agencies that have responsibility for them in the Park. WWF strongly recommends that the NPA were a statutory consultee on all issues dealt with by these public bodies. This would allow the NPA to take a decision as to whether they want to refer any particular matter that goes against the National Park's objectives or the plan to the Minister. (K/0273)</p>
Support for incentives for land owners and managers to aid Park aims	B/0154		L/0308, K/0231, K/0273	4	<p>Land Management - As a farmer within the proposed park area who has participated in the LLESA Scheme since its introduction, it seems odd to me why the replacement for that scheme ie. the R.S.S. is discretionary and that therefore some farms within the National Park will not gain access to the land management benefits of this scheme. There therefore has to be an environmental scheme with automatic entry specific to the NP. All farmers and land managers within the NP must be afforded equal opportunity to "enhance the natural heritage of the area." (B/0154)</p> <p>It is essential that the NPA has positive incentive powers as well as regulatory powers to complement and be additional to the Rural Stewardship Scheme, e.g. agri-environment grants. (K/0231)</p> <p>We also strongly recommend that the NPA be given positive powers in these areas. This would include powers such as the ability to make grants for agri-environment and forestry schemes in addition to those made by other</p>

					agencies, so that the NPA can develop a proactive role for themselves in working with land users to better manage the area. Without such powers, and the resources to enact them, the National Park might come to be seen as a hindrance to local development rather than the driver of sustainable development in the area. (K/0273)
Support for the preparation of an Indicative Forestry Strategy	K/0180			1	Indicative Forestry Strategies should be carried out by the NPA in consultation with the local authorities. (K/0180)
Support for the preparation of a Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the Park area			K/0290, K/0298, K/0311, K/0344, L/0308, K/0231, N/0263	7	<p>In one important respect the powers of the Park Authority are deficient. Namely it should be charged with the responsibility for preparing and implementing a Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the entire Park area. Such a plan is crucial to the effective delivery of biodiversity actions within the park and to ensuring that development policy and decisions are made against knowledge of habitats and species of importance. (K/0311)</p> <p>The proposed National Park Authority should be responsible statutory for preparing its own Action Plan as part of the Local Plan process and should give appropriate priority to the production of an audit of species and habitat priorities within the proposed National Park area. (N/0263)</p>
Support for powers in respect to water management	L/0201, O/0202		A/0249, K/0052, O/0348	5	<p>The club regards Loch Lomond as a place of national importance for its immense scenic, historic, cultural and recreational value which must be paramount over its importance as a water supply reservoir. While the conflicting demands on the loch may successfully co-exist in harmony, we believe that the National Park must be given superiority over the Water Authorities in long term strategy and in reserve powers. Significant erosion damage to the shoreline has occurred in the last 30 years as a result of poor control of water levels since the start of water extraction." (L0201)</p> <p>Loch Lomond is being seriously despoiled by the use as water reservoir; horrendous erosion damage to the shores has followed the building of the barrage and the control of water levels. The Park must have control over the water authority so that they can stop this damage. (A/0249)</p>
Support for powers to control motor boats,	L/0201, O/0080, K/0094		A/0057, A/0188, A/0249, L/0130	7	I would repeat points which I raised in the earlier consultation about the need to give increased powers to the existing bylaws or if that is not legally

helicopters and light aircraft					<p>feasible, then to introduce legislation which will be in effect superior to the bylaws on certain matters. These matters relate to having control over the speed and noise of fast motor craft and to instituting standards about insurance, competence to drive and alcohol limits. The present speed limit of 50 mph (except in small areas and close to the shore) is totally inappropriate, being unsafe and encouraging to craft and activity completely at odds with the environment and its natural life. It is an irresponsible system which allows individuals as young as 14 yrs. to drive craft at this speed and manoeuvre among other boats such as paddling canoes and sailing dinghies moving at little more than walking pace. (A/0188)</p> <p>What requires to be done at this stage in the development of the powers for the National Park Authority to ensure that the Authority can make byelaws to control hovercraft and aircraft, such as low flying helicopters, and float planes landing on the lochs within the National Park. (K/0094)</p> <p>The park authority must have the powers to make byelaws for control and effective regulation of speed of vessels, with the aim of reducing the speed limit over much of the loch's surface; control of noise (both on the water and on land); zoning for speed and for type of waterborne activity; zoning in time for activities where any disturbance is caused to wildlife or to other park users. (L/0201)</p> <p>St Fillans is an outstandingly scenic gateway to this area, and its amenity is being ruined by the noise and intrusion of selfish jet-skiers and speedboats. We would greatly appreciate your assurance that this nuisance will receive priority in your plan for the area, and would like to know the measures you propose (based on your long and unique experience of other areas) and how they can be enforced (O/0080)</p>
Support for powers in respect to cultural heritage			A/0040, G/0336	2	<p>The powers listed in 3.5, though including listed building consent, do not specifically mention ancient monument consent (or other scheduled monument consent) which is a natural corollary to the other powers listed and essential if the areas archaeology is to be included in an integrated, holistic and structured way. Further a sites and monuments record maintained by a qualified archaeologist would be an essential element of the</p>

					<p>National Parks staffing structure. To have a National Park Authority without these powers would seem to disable it from the start and prevent it from fulfilling its full potential to make a difference. (A/0040)</p> <p>The table does not seem to be explicit in respect of the cultural heritage.HS would be content in principle for the Park Authority to have comparable powers in respect of archaeological and built heritage as existing local authorities have, provided that it has access to the necessary expertise to enable it to carry out those powers effectively. If the Authority has planning powers, this expertise will need to embrace the range of functions set out in National Planning Policy Guidelines 5 and 18, and in HS circular 1/96 (copy attached; see in particular sections 7 and 8). In addition, however the Authority should ensure that it has the necessary expertise to carry out positive conservation management and interpretation effectively. (G/0336)</p>
Support for powers in respect to education and interpretation		0	K/0273	1	<p>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. ...WWF therefore recommends that the National Park has wider powers to be able to undertake learning needs assessment and capacity building activities with local stakeholders, agencies and institutions to ensure the success of the park. Without such work it is likely that the ability to participate in the management of the area will be restricted to those who already have access to decision-making processes and have the technical skills to exploit those opportunities. An obvious mechanism with which to deliver these aims would be the Community Learning Strategies and plans for the area. WWF recommends that the NPA become the lead body in formulating these in the same way that it leads in the planning process. (K/0273)</p>
Queries regarding implications of proposed powers			A/0032, C/0175, L/0335, M/0048	4	<p>It is proposed that the NPA will have powers to; provide or promote leisure facilities; provide recreational, sporting and social facilities; improve waterways for recreation. It is not clear to me whether or not the operation of those proposed powers will interfere with the existing arrangements. Will existing angling clubs be able to continue to operate as before, or will their functions be subsumed into the administration of the Park? If the latter is the case, will there be some form of compensation? (A/0032)</p>

					<p>In order for the Park Authority to carry out its management functions effectively, it will be necessary for certain powers to be within its control. It is not clear whether the Park Authority will be able to exercise all the SNH powers in their area; for example, ranger provision, all bye-laws, different types of access, management and footpath agreements. It is assumed that grant aid powers will remain with SNH but that these would be exercised in consultation with the National Park. (C/0175)</p> <p>It is not clear to the Association whether existing powers to make bylaws of management rules are sufficient to deal with the situation at Loch Lomond where some recreational activities may be mutually conflicting and where the participants may claim to be exercising a right of navigation, but this may be a matter which requires primary legislation. (M/0048)</p>
Disagree with powers proposed (or aspects of them)	A/0185, B/0017, H/0145		G/0004, L/0086 L/0135	6	<p>We fear that the list of powers to be given to the NPA result in duplication with existing public authorities. In many cases there is no justifiable case for granting these powers. The added cost of granting these powers, alongside and in co-operative partnership with other agencies, is unjustifiable and would have to be met from the public purse, putting a further burden on the taxpayer. (H/0145)</p> <p>...the Clyde Yacht Clubs Association wishes to draw to your attention that moorings (in tidal waters) for leisure craft are managed on behalf of Crown Estates by the Clyde Moorings Committee. The CMC is chaired by Clydeport plc's Harbourmaster, with responsibilities from HM Naval Base Clyde, the ferry operators, the CYCA and others. Having discussed the matter with the Clydeport Harbourmaster we would strongly recommend that the powers of any NPA should not extend to conflict with the CMC (L/0086).</p> <p>We are concerned that charges are not levied on access to any of the waters in the park. It is appreciated that it may be acceptable to make a reasonable charge for use of facilities where these have been specially provided. (L/0135)</p>
Opposition to compulsory purchase powers	A/0068, B/0317, B/0044	B/0177	K/0052	5	<p>Schedule 2, 5 plans to give the Park Authority powers of compulsory purchase. This draconian power should not be available to a Board which contains a high proportion of appointees rather than democratically elected</p>

				<p>members. (B/0317)</p> <p>Of greater concern is P.18, 5(1)(b) ... "if authorised by Scottish Ministers (an Authority may) purchase compulsorily any land situated within the National Park." We trust this does not mean any part of any farm desired. A whole farm would have to be purchased at full market value. (B/0177)</p> <p>We do not agree with sequestration of land by the state, but we visualise the Park Board obtaining an accord with owners, which respects their interests while promoting the objectives of the National Park. In the unlikely event of the Park Board failing to come to agreement with an owner, then arbitration would be in the hands of Holyrood." (K/0052)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Question 11: Views on the approach to the planning function, and specifically the merits of the preferred option for the Park Authority becoming the planning authority for the area, with responsibility for preparing the local plan and making development control decisions based on it

Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for the NPA becoming the planning authority with responsibility for production of the local plan and development control	A/0053; A/0065; A/0104; A/0133; A/0139, B/0077, B/0287, B/0288, C/0187, C/0200, D/0123, D/0148, D/0171, B/0286, H/0261, K/0062, K/0180, L/0201, O/0127, P/0292	A/0128, A/0353, D/0056, D/0316, D/0320	A/0009, A/0033, A/0040, A/0105; A/0134, A/0152, A/0168, A/0220, A/0264, C/0063, C/0120, C/0175, C/0227, D/0315, E/0122, E/0250, E/0289, E/0299, E/0301, E/0345, F/0119, F/0268, F/0303, G/0329, H/069, H/0195, J/0194, K/0129, K/0212, K/0257, K/0318, K/0052, L/0100, L/0130, L/0271, L/0296, L/0306, L/0325, M/0048, N/0155, N/0263, N/0332, O/0013, O/0078, O/0097, O/0114, O/0259, O/0293, O/0309, O/0324, O/0348, P/0282	77	<p>For the sound reasons outlined within the Report the National Park should be given the additional powers detailed in 3.34 - 3.35. The split between the local plan and development central (National Park) and the Structure Plan (local authority) makes sense for the perspective at integration and the wider planning framework. (A/0040)</p> <p>It is considered that the Park Authority become the Planning Authority for the area, for the following reasons: a) An integrated approach throughout the Park. B) Planning sympathetic to the objects of the National Park without undue influence from commercial lobbies or views from outside the Park boundaries. (A/0065)</p> <p>I consider it essential that the NPA are designated as the Planning Authority for the area and are therefore responsible for Local Plan and development control decisions. I agree with the present proposal that the existing Local Authorities remain responsible for structure plans - but in the preparation of any such structure plans full liaison and consultation must be had with the NPA. (A/0128)</p> <p>The National Park planning function must be exercised having due regard to the promotion of sustainable economic and social development of the areas communities. Additional costs should be mitigated by grants or subsidies in order to provide incentive to further desired development standards. (B/0077)</p> <p>Planning. There should be a level-playing field as far as this is concerned. There should be no exemptions as at present for Crown authorities, e.g. Forestry, Hydro, etc. We are of the opinion that it would be preferable, in order to expedite planning applications if planning was undertaken by one body, rather than involving numerous councils. (D/0056)</p>

				<p>Argyll and Bute Council has consistently supported the case for the Council retaining its Structure Plan powers whilst conceding that Local Plan and development control powers for a National Park such as Loch Lomond and the Trossachs would rest with the Park Authority. There is nothing in the consultative document which alters that position. (D/0316)</p> <p>In relation to planning powers, the Council believes that the full range of planning powers, with the exception of structure planning, should be transferred to the National Park Authority. Local plans for Loch Lomond have been prepared on a joint basis over a number of years and the three constituent councils have agreed to delegate decision making on planning applications to the Interim Committee. These precedents argue in favour of these planning powers being transferred to the National Park Authority. The "other functions" are intimately related to local plan and planning application decisions and should also be transferred to the National Park Authority. Concerns have been expressed by Members that householders in suburban housing areas (such as the Mollanbowie Estate, Balloch) might find it unduly difficult to obtain planning permission for ordinary domestic extensions. The council has asked that, in taking on Development Control powers, the National Park Authority acknowledges that within such areas normal, rather than special, development control design policies should apply. (E/0122)</p> <p>Local plan and development control decisions should be vested in the Park Authority but structure plan powers should remain with the local authorities so that the Park is not divorced from the wider area in which it is situated. (H/0069)</p> <p>The Association welcomes the indication that Scottish Ministers have a preference for the Park Authority to become the planning authority with responsibility for preparing the local plan and for development control. In many ways it would have been better had the Park Authority been made responsible also for the preparation of the structure plan, as it will have to accommodate its wishes with up to four different structure plans prepared by the local authorities concerned. If the existing proposal is adopted then it will undoubtedly be necessary for Scottish Ministers to ensure that the structure</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>plans take due cognisance of the national park plan for the park area. (M/0048)</p> <p>We are generally content with the proposals, as far as they go. They should be based on the exercise of all the powers under the planning acts (Town and Country Planning, Listed Building and Conservation Areas and Hazardous Substances Acts of 1997). and related acts, with the exception of structure planning powers, analogous to the two tier system prior to 1996. It is the powers reserved to the local authorities in respect of structure planning which should be specified and not vice versa. It should be noted that this definition will allow the NPA to exercise its powers under the Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967 as a planning authority as well as an authority under the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. For the purposes of managing the planning function, the NPA should also have the relevant powers of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 such as: a) Arrangements for discharge of functions (including delegation) (Section 56) b) Appointment of committees (including joint committees) (Section 57 and 58). The Institute considers that the situation of the proposed National Park within the areas of three, possibly four structure plans is less than satisfactory, particularly as the number of substantive strategic planning issues will be few. Structure plan areas may be adjusted by amendment to the Designation of Structure Plan area (Scotland) Order 1995 which the Institute would wish to see in due course. Possible options include:- a) Restructuring so that the Park fell entirely within one or other of the three existing structure plan areas. b) New arrangements involving unitary (i.e.. single tier) development plans subject to a framework of national and sub-national guidance. It should be noted that the allocation of planning powers to the NPA not only removes them from local authority control for the first time in Scotland but also divorces them from the building control function. There are a number of management issues to be considered here, such as the submission of plans by the public and the exchange of monitoring information with regard to new development. (N/0332)</p> <p>Our view is that having the National Park as the Planning Authority would provide a coherence and consistency of development across the area. There would then be equal opportunities across the park for sustainable</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					development. (O/0324)
					Planning should be the function of the Park Authority, but we feel that there should be grounds for reference or appeal to the relevant local authority. (P/0282)
Support for the NPA becoming the planning authority as proposed, but also with structure planning powers (structure planning arrangements unspecified)	A/0166, A/0170, A/0255, A/0280, D/0225, L/0297,		A/0204, A/0328, D/0162, G/0304, K/0273, K/0163, L0218, O/0270	14	<p>It is important that the management committee should have full powers in planning issues and the Structure Plans. This includes the veto of any proposals by the Crown properties which may go against the overall view and the ability to insist that their wishes are met. (A/0170)</p> <p>We are supportive of the National park having full powers, including responsibility for the generation of development plans and development control. (B/0136)</p> <p>ACC agreed that the National Park Authority should be responsible for Structure Planning. (D/0225)</p> <p>SORN considers that the National Park should have full planning powers including structure planning powers. SORN is concerned that if the National Park does not have structure planning powers, there could be considerable delay to the adoption of a local plan for the Park, given the current absence of approved structure policy that directly addresses the National Park. (G/0304)</p> <p>CNP considers that it is very important that the NPA becomes the planning authority under the 1997 Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act with responsibility for preparing the Local Plan and carrying out development control functions. The Park should also be a Structure Plan Authority, the reasons for this being set out below. The main benefits of preparing a strategic plan covering the National Park would be to set the right strategic framework for encouraging development that furthers the purposes of designation, pre-empts inappropriate schemes and minimises incremental damaging development. (K/0267)</p> <p>The planning functions (para 3.34) and the other functions listed in para 3.35</p>

					<p>must all be taken on by the National Park Authority to enable it to operate effectively and efficiently. The Park Authority must also be a Structure Plan Authority preparing either a Structure Plan for the Park area, or a Structure Plan covering the Park area in conjunction with adjacent Structure Plan Authorities. Structure Plans require agreement of the Secretary of State , who would therefore resolve differences between the Park and the adjacent Authorities. (K/0163)</p> <p>We feel that there may well be difficult conflicts of interest in the future if the National Park Authority is not given structure planning powers within the Park area as we believe is the case in the English and Welsh National Parks. The laudable objectives of the Scottish Executive for an integrated and more focussed approach to planning issues could, we believe, be achieved simply by the various Local Authorities being statutory consultees as is proposed. (L/0297)</p> <p>Giving the NPA Structure Planning powers would also help take development pressures off the National Park (e.g. open market housing pressure in the way that the Peak District and Lake District NPA's have done). A NPA with structure planning powers would also ensure that the Structure Plan contained policies to protect the sensitive fringe outside the National Park area. As the NPA would not have direct planning control over the fringe area this is a very important advantage. (K/0267)</p>
Support for the NPA becoming the planning authority (solely responsible for preparing the structure plan for its area)	J/0198, A/0174, A/0191, A/0199, A/0278, D/0172, K/0094, J/0095		A/0249, K/0197, K/0231, K/0267, K/0284, K/0290, K/0294, L/0308	16	<p>Sole responsibility for the Structure Plan would also have merit. If the latter is not considered feasible having regard to the complication of 3 (or 4) local authorities (LA) having structure plan responsibilities currently which include parts of the NP it will be essential that work is thoroughly co-ordinated to ensure a consistent range of structure plan policies covering the whole of the NP. To achieve this the NPA should be formally recognised as a joint structure plan authority with the adjoining local authorities. (A/0092)</p> <p>We are strongly of opinion that the Park Authority must be the planning authority for the area. We take the view that the Park Authority should be responsible for their own structure plan without undue constraints from surrounding Local Authorities. (J/0198)</p>

					<p>We therefore propose that the Park authority is the structure plan authority for the park area. If this is not acceptable then we consider that the National Park Authority should be responsible and take the lead as the Structure Plan Authority, but working in conjunction with the three local authorities to produce the Structure Plan. (K/0094)</p> <p>APRS firmly believes that to be effective the National Park Authority has to have a wide range of powers including responsibility for structure planning, local planning and development control. With three or four authorities involved in the LL & T NP there will be that number of Structure Plans, at different stages, and numerous Local Plans, again at different stages. This is unworkable in our view. We believe it is essential that the NPA develops a single Structure Plan (in consultation with the LA's communities and other stakeholders), and replacement Local Plans and Subject Plans as relevant. (K/0284)</p> <p>There should be a single Structure Plan for the whole park area and this should be the responsibility of the Park Authority who should set down minimum guidelines and see that these are worked to. (J/0095)</p>
Support for the NPA becoming the planning authority (joint structure planning arrangements for the area)	D/0326		A/0092, A0/189, A/0204, K/0311, K/0298, G/0228, N/0300	8	<p>sportscotland considers that joint structure planning arrangements should be established with the surrounding Local Authorities. The Proposal recognises the need for the National Park to work beyond its boundaries and it is considered that joint structure planning will encourage proper consideration of this. It is considered that by involving the surrounding local authorities in the park it will encourage interest in the future well being of the park and create a sense of ownership amongst the surrounding authorities. (G/0228)</p> <p>On the basis of experience within Britain and abroad we believe that there is a compelling case for the National Park Authority to have full planning powers, with responsibility for preparing the local plan and for making development control decisions. The National Park Authority should be the Planning Authority, as it must have a broad view of what is currently happening and what is proposed within the National Park. We also believe that the Park area should be the structure Plan area, so that important</p>

					<p>strategic decisions can be taken in the best interests of the Park. The preparation of this plan must involve equally and jointly the Park Authority and each of the three local authorities, the latter having wider considerations to take into account. (K/0311)</p> <p>It will also be essential that the national park authority exercises all the planning and other functions in paragraphs 3.34 and 3.35. If any of these functions are delegated this should only be done under a formal delegation agreement, which provides ultimate responsibility vesting in the national park authority in the event of a dispute. It would be preferable for the function also to include responsibility for the Structure Plan. If the latter is not accepted this work must be undertaken jointly with the contiguous local authorities so that their Structure Plans, while each a separate entity, nevertheless contain a consistent range of policies relevant to the whole of the national park. (N/0300)</p>
Support for local authorities remaining as the sole planning authorities	A/0138		A/0031, E/0054, F/0034, J/0233	5	<p>Planning and all other matters that are currently the responsibility of local authorities should remain so. The introduction of another Planning authority would be confusing, unwieldy and expensive. (A/0138)</p> <p>At all costs a duplication of planning controls must be avoided. I believe they must remain with the Local Authority, though obviously with close liaison with the National Park Authority and other Quangos. (F/0034)</p> <p>The Union opposes any move of powers under the town and country planning system from local authorities. There are two reasons why the Union wants retention of planning powers by local authorities: democratic accountability – farmers are comfortable with the arrangements which presently exist. Were a body to have planning powers which is only partly democratically accountable, the machinery would not be as capable of representation through the usual channels; cross-boundary equivalence - there is great pressure on farm businesses to diversify and any non-agricultural business on farmland comes within the planning constraints applying to other commercial businesses. The Union does not want equivalent enterprises on either side of a Park boundary to be treated differently by the planning machinery. Where any extra conditions apply to</p>

					farms within a Park area, there should be full compensation from Park expenditure. (J/0233)
Support for other options for the planning function	A/0012, A/0205, C/0187, O/0202	D/0091		5	<p>The National Park Authority should have the responsibility of preparing its own Structure Plan with individual local authorities dovetailing into it rather than the other way round. Trying to integrate three or four Structure Plans will be extremely problematical. Development control powers are essential. (A/0205)</p> <p>Now that the provision of a National Park for the area is a reality, I would recommend that the local plan function should be prepared by the Park Authority in conjunction with the adjacent local authorities. Before implementation, the plan would be approved by the local authorities which would ensure that the local plan accorded with the authorities overall structure plan. Development control would then be the remit of the Park Authority, being a function of any policies stemming from the structure and local plans. (A/0112)</p> <p>If the NPA has a local planning responsibility it will have to operate within the constraints and the parameters of three (possible four) local authority structure plans a situation ripe for confusion and frustration. Balfron Community Council believes that in order to achieve the aims of the Park the NPA needs strategic (structure planning) powers, with the local authorities in the role of statutory consultee. The local plan responsibility should remain with the local authorities and development applications considered in the usual way be them with the NPA acting as a statutory consultee to the Local Plan. (D/0091)</p>
Concerns over issues surrounding parity of treatment for those on the Park's periphery	C/0200, P/0292	D/0316		3	The planning authority must be single tier for communities both inside and just outside the boundaries on the NP (D/0316)

Question 12: The Consultation arrangements between the Park Authority and the Local Authority, and on which types of cases it would be particularly important for the National Park Authority to seek the views of the Local Authority					
Category of Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for consultation on all cases	A/0191, B/0077, C/0187, D/0171, O/0127		A/0063, B/0310, E/0301, J/0194, L/0308, N/0332, O/0013, O/0078, O/0348	14	<p>The local authority should be a consultee on all development proposals. It will be very difficult to define what is of particular importance to a local authority, particularly in boundary overlaps. A policy to consult on all proposals will be required for Perth & Kinross because it will not be adequately represented. (B/0310)</p> <p>The Park Authority should be required to consult the relevant local authority on all development applications, despite the duplication of effort that will be involved, because the local authority retains responsibility for many aspects of the infrastructure and services (e.g. transport, education, cleansing) (C/0063)</p> <p>Argyll and Bute Council supports the proposal obliging the Park Authority "to notify Scottish Ministers of any proposal they are minded to give planning permission for against the wishes of the local authority" and would wish to be notified of all development proposals within their area in order to monitor the social/economic aspirations of the area. (E/0301)</p> <p>We strongly believe that the local authority should have a right by statute to be consulted on all planning applications received but that the NPA should enter an informal "development control agreement" with each of the local authorities with regard to those categories of application on which they would wish to waive this right. (N/0332)</p>
Support for consultation on some cases		D/0320	A/0040, A/0092, A/0134, A/0189, A/0264, A/0328, C/0175, E/0266, E/0313, G/0186, G/0329, H/0069, H/0195, K/0052, K/0284, K/0290,	22	<p>It would be desirable for Local Authorities to be statutory consultees over planning proposals in the National Park, however it may not be necessary to consult on all applications. Minor alterations and extensions, householder applications and advertisement consent applications, perhaps do not require to be referred. (A0264)</p> <p>..... in respect of consultation on planning applications, these should include: the sending of a weekly list of all planning applications received to</p>

			K/0311, N/0243, N/0263, N/0300, O/0114		<p>all local authorities in the Park area, Formal consultation on agreed categories of application, a requirement for referral to Scottish Ministers where the Park Authority propose to approve, refuse or impose conditions on applications, contrary to the view of the appropriate authority. (E/0266)</p> <p>Consultation should only take place therefore for those applications of a more strategic nature (which may require definition) or where the Local Authority has a particular interest where consultation requires to take place (for example Structure Plan commitments, strategic developments with cross-boundary influences etc.) Guidance on this would be required in order for the arrangement to work effectively. (G/0329)</p>
Support for use of a weekly list	A/0278, E/0122, K/0094		A/0152, E/0250, E/0266, E/0289	7	<p>As any planning authority will draw up a list of planning applications and ought to send a copy to each community council, and give community councils an opportunity to see all applications affecting their area, there should be no difficulty in extending this practice to the local authority. A local authority needs to know about applications which might result in material increases in burdens on local services, such as education, waste disposal and public transport, or result in out of district impacts such as additional power lines or substantial lorry movements. (A/0152)</p> <p>I suggest that the Park Authority should publish a weekly list of applications and the local authority, community councils and appropriate voluntary bodies should select for consultation such applications as they consider appropriate. (A/0278)</p> <p>Stirling Council agrees that the consultation arrangements on planning issues be put in place should reflect those of the old two tier planning system, in that the local authority should retain the power to require consultation, and referral to Scottish Ministers if approval is to be granted contrary to the Local Authority's advice. A weekly list of applications received, with the Local Authority's right to request a consultation would be practical and appropriate. (E/0250)</p>
Support for consultation on all cases at first,	H/0121		N/0155	2	<p>The option of the Park Authority consulting on all planning applications may be the most appropriate in the first instance. Following experience and review, a system to identify and consult only on relevant applications could</p>

followed by greater selection in due course					<p>then be agreed, again with a review and audit mechanism to ensure that this essential function was working in an efficient and effective manner. (H/0121)</p> <p>Consultation arrangements between the Park Authority and the local authorities must be clearly defined in order to ensure that there is no misunderstanding or duplication of work (that the Park Authority consults on all development proposals). We would suggest that option 1 may be the most appropriate arrangement, at least in the first few months of the Park's operation. Whilst we appreciate that this may create additional work, this arrangement would at least ensure that local authorities were fully aware of all developments. Furthermore, there would be no possibility of any misunderstanding between the Park Authority and the local authorities as to what is, or is not, considered important to the local authorities. In the longer term, the requirement to consult on all developments could be reviewed. Guidelines could be agreed between the Park Authority and the local authorities which clearly list the specific categories of development which should be the subject of consultation. In this respect, the Park Authority and the local authorities may wish to draw on the experience of the delegation arrangements in operation in National Parks elsewhere in the UK. (N/0155)</p>
General support for consultation of the NPA by local authorities	A/0199, J/0198		L/0296	3	The Park Authority should become statutory consultees to the local authorities particularly in relation to those areas contiguous to the Park. The local authorities should be obliged to notify Scottish Ministers of any planning permission they wish to grant against the wishes of the Park Authority. (A/0199)
Comments on the need for good communication			A/0220, K/0231	2	There must be communication between all Departments both within and outwith the Park. The Local Authorities should be able to consult with and if applicable agree/disagree with Park decisions, likewise the Park should be able to do the same. It is all a matter of good communication.(A/0220)
Comments on cross boundary implications of proposed developments			O/0309	1	Adequate provision should also be made for the notification and consultation of local authorities whose areas, while not within the area to which a National Park proposal relates, may be affected by proposals coming from the National Park Authority. An example would be where the re-routing of traffic within the Park affects flows on the roads in adjacent local authorities, another would be where conservation measures taken, say in relation to the marine environment, affect adjacent areas outwith the Park. Such a

					provision for consultation would not, however, imply that all local authorities outwith the Park's agreed boundaries would need to be members of the National Park Body. Similarly, provision should be made to enable Park Authorities to influence events outside the designated area that may have an impact on the area. For example, the construction of a dam for irrigation, water supply or industrial purposes upstream from a park, deforestation or changes in use of neighbouring land that may affect the faunal balance in a park or alter the pattern of water-run off, or mining operations. (O/0309)
Support for flexibility in consultation arrangements	H/0261			1	That the Designation Order should not seek to be prescriptive about development control consultation arrangements, but rather should place a duty on the Park Authority to put in place mutually agreed arrangements. (H/0261)
Support for delegation of certain issues of planning control to local authorities			K/0294	1	The NPA should have powers to delegate some issues of planning control which are not relevant to the Park aims to the appropriate Council. (K/0294)

Question 13: The requirements which should be placed on the composition of any planning sub-committee of the National Park Authority necessary to ensure democratic accountability for planning decisions

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations	Observed
Support for a majority of elected representatives (term 'elected' unspecified)	A/0199, B/0077, C/0187, C/0200, J/0198, O/0127, O/0202	D/0320	A/0112, A/0189, A/0221, A/0247, C/0063, E/0122, H/0314, N/0332, O/0013	17	<p>Any planning sub-committee should certainly have a majority of elected members who have to be aware of the wider implications of any decisions taken. (A/0221)</p> <p>If the National Park Authority is to be charged with the planning function it will have to ensure that the in-built majority of elected members is "copper fastened" in order to deal with planning matters. A sub-committee of the Park Authority with a majority of un-elected members would not meet the principle of democratic accountability." (B/0077)</p> <p>If local democratic accountability is considered important, consideration should be given to increasing the proportion of directly elected local representatives on the Board. Members nominated by local authorities cannot be considered democratically accountable even if they are elected councilors, unless they represent wards that are within the National Park area. Even if they do represent local wards, they will only represent parts of the National Park area. It should therefore be accepted that, with the exception of directly elected local members, democratic accountability should be through the Scottish Parliament who will be responsible for appointments to the Board. (C/0063)</p> <p>On para 3-39 we think that the planning sub-committee of the National Park Authority should contain a majority of elected members and the sub committee should not be quorate without such a majority being present. (D/0320)</p> <p>The council recommends that the composition of any committee or sub-committee responsible for planning related matters should have a majority of elected representatives. (E/0122)</p> <p>We agree that current philosophies dictate that democratically elected members are responsible for all planning decisions, whether or not there is</p>	

				<p>delegation to officials. We support the proposal that elected members should therefore be in the majority on a planning committee. We would, however expect that delegation to officials would be extensive and that planning committees would deal only with significant applications. Accordingly, we would also anticipate that an agenda of important applications would attract a good turnout, precluding the possibility that poor attendance might result in non-elected members being in the majority when decisions are actually taken. There should, however be encouragement to adopt Standing Orders which give full delegation to the planning committee to reduce delays.... (N/0332)</p> <p>If a planning sub-committee is established for the Park Authority at least two thirds of its membership should be elected members of the Park Authority (O/0202)</p> <p>We are of opinion that the only way to achieve democratic accountability for planning decisions is to have a sufficient number of Board members directly elected by the residents within the park area. We do not agree that appointees nominated by Local Authorities should be considered as elected members in relation to the Park Board. (J/0198)</p> <p>Democratic accountability. It is false to regard the simple delegation of powers to nominated members who happen to be elected councilors as providing any satisfactory democratic accountability. The link between the local voters and the nominees is too indirect and weak, and trying to present such nominated councillors as offering democratic control over who is nominated (especially when only a small part of the local authority's area is within the park). Either the directly elected members must take the primary role (say as a clear majority of the planning committee), or it has to be accepted that the whole structure of the Park Authority rests on the basis that democratic accountability is only one of the factors on which the concept is founded. On the latter view, the directly elected members could still be given prominence, but the planning committee can justifiably represent the Park Authority as a whole. (O/0013)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Support for both directly elected and local representation	K/0094		D/0162, E/0250, E/0266, E/0301, E/0289, H/0069, H/0195, L/0306, N/0300	10	<p>..we believe that the make-up of the planning committee should be so structured as to ensure a majority of directly elected and local authority numbers over Scottish Executive appointees. (D/0162)</p> <p>Stirling Council considers that it is essential that a committee which makes planning decisions has a majority of members not appointed by Scottish Ministers (i.e. the majority should be made up of directly elected plus local authority nominated members). (E/0250)</p> <p>... they is some concern, particularly in the tourism sector, about development control decisions being made by appointees who are not democratically elected. It is essential that key decisions remain with an accountable authority and there should, therefore, be on any planning committee a majority of democratically elected members who are obliged to give due cognisance to the impact of any decisions on areas outwith the National Park, particularly those areas on the periphery. (H/0195)</p> <p>We consider that for democratic reasons that it would be advisable for the National Park Authority planning sub-committee to have a majority of "elected members" (directly elected members and local authority elected councillors who are nominated members). However, we propose that there should be a limit on the proposed number of elected members to ensure that the national view is also available with the planning sub-committee. We therefore suggest that "elected members" on the planning sub-committee should be at least 51% and no more than 60% this latter percentage reflecting the balance of the National Park Authority, assuming that the nominated local authority members are elected councilors. (K/0094)</p> <p>We have a concern that the NPA will be in effect, a quango (the board elected reps comprising a small minority), but the arrangement set out at Annex 1, para 11, in regard to planning, should satisfy that concern. (L/0306)</p>
Support for a significant proportion of local authority nominations	A/0174		A/0009, D/0172	3	<p>At least half of the local planning sub-committee should be local members, as defined in the Act. (A/0174)</p> <p>The planning sub-committee of the authority should have at least 50%</p>

					representation of local members. (D/0172)
Comments on the balance of local authority nominations	C/0187		E/0266, K/0290, N/0155,	4	<p>The planning sub committee of the Park Board should contain a majority of members who live within the boundaries of the Park Area and no individual Council should provide a majority of members of this sub committee. (C/0187)</p> <p>Any planning sub-committee must have a board member nominated by each of the local authorities within the Park Area. (K/0290)</p>
Comments suggesting that the composition of the planning sub-committee should reflect that of the Board	A/0191, A/0278		A/0328, K/0231, K/0294, L/0308, O/0270	7	<p>I suggest that the planning committee of the Park Authority should have the identical percentage make up as the Park Authority between directly elected members, local authority members, and those appointed by the Scottish Executive. (A/0278)</p> <p>The sub-committee would require members with the correct skills in order to make sensitive planning decisions. The proportions of Scottish Ministers nominations. Council nominations and locally elected board members should be replicated in a sub-committee. Any planning decision with potential to make a significant impact on any of the NP objectives should be referred to the full NPA and the Sandford Principle applied where conflict exists. (K/0294)</p> <p>While any planning sub-committee must be democratically accountable, it must also hold the necessary expertise for the resolution of the specific issues with which it is tasked. We suggest that this balance is best achieved through: standing orders of a sub-committee set by the NPA itself, the sub committee having the same representational structure as the NPA itself (i.e. 2:2:1, national appointments, council nominees, elected members), and by provision for very significant development control or strategic issues to be referred to the full NPA. (K/0231)</p> <p>Representation on planning committees should reflect the composition of the Park Authority Board. (O/0270)</p>
Views rejecting the need for a planning sub-committee	A0138		A0092, K0163, K0052	4	<p>The need for a planning sub-committee will only arise if Planning ceases to be a local authority responsibility and the composition of the National Park Board has a minority of elected members. Surely the solution to ensure</p>

					<p>democratic accountability should lie in avoiding either Planning becoming the responsibility of the National Park Body, or ensuring that a majority of that Board is elected. To establish an additional sub-committee to ensure democratic accountability for planning decisions seems a ludicrous concept when the remedy lies in a democratically constituted Board in the first place. (A/0138)</p> <p>We have difficulty addressing this point, as we do not agree with the current proposed framework for representation on the Park Board. (see 3.40-3.47) (K/0052)</p>
General comments supportive of the notion that a planning sub-committee should be formed	D/0351, H/0121		C/0175, H/0248, J/0194, K/0284, K/0311, N/0243, N0300	9	<p>As regards any planning sub-committee of the NPA to be established, obviously the skills of those elected/nominated on to the NP Board will be relevant, but whatever happens we consider training for all sub-committee members will be essential. Planning Committees of local authorities are often criticised for lack of vision, self interest and so on and this must not be allowed to happen in the case of the NP. (K/0284)</p> <p>The authority supports the view that the Park Authority should become the planning authority for the area since this is a key control mechanism to realise National Park aims. In the event that a planning sub-committee requires to be established then the composition should be representative of the local area and reflect the aims of the National Park. (H/0121)</p> <p>The society accepts that, where the Park Authority does not have a majority of local authority councillors or directly elected members on its Board, a sub-committee of the Park Authority should be formed to deal with development proposals. (O/0309)</p> <p>However it is accepted that in the unlikely situation of the local authorities not putting forward Councillors, a sub-committee should be formed. (C/0175)</p> <p>The SLF believes that democratic accountability in planning decisions must be pursued. If the National Park Authority is to be charged with the planning function, necessary measures to ensure that the principle of accountability is safeguarded must be necessary. Planning sub-committees will, therefore</p>

					need to involve elected members of the local authorities. (J/0194)
The need for access to specialist advice	H/0261		K/0290, L/0218, O/0293, O/0324	5	<p>Planning sub-committees must have ready access to specialist advice re natural and cultural heritage preferably through inclusion of this expertise in the sub-committee composition. (K/0290)</p> <p>As the area is proposed to be a National Park, there should also be a recognition that national representatives (i.e.. those appointed by Ministers) need to have a strong role in the planning process. (O/0293)</p> <p>The composition of planning sub committees of the National Park Authority must reflect the balance of interests in the delivery of the Park's aims. Appropriate expertise relating to the specific nature of the planning decision must be ensured. Where recreational interests are concerned this must include consultation with the relevant governing bodies. (L/0218)</p> <p>That any National Park Planning sub-committee must comprise only of full board members, and must strike a suitable balance between accountability and allowing national interests to contribute to decision making. (H/0261)</p>

Question 14: Views on the size of the Park Board

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for 25	A/0065, A/0068, A/0102, A/0138, A/0174, A/0191, A/0199, A/0280, D/0171, D/0172, D/0326, E/0122, H/0261, J/0198, K/0094	B/0136, D/0091, D/0320	A/0168, A/0189, A/0328, C/0120, C/0175, C/0181, E/0126, E/0250, E/0301, F/0119, F/0235, F/0303, G/0186, G/0228, H/0069, H/0195, H/0340, J/0194, K/0284, K/0294, K/0298, K/0311, L/0100, L/0218, L/0271, L/0308, K/0231, N/0155, N/0263, N/0332, O/013, O/O114, O/0270, O/0309	52	<p>The National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 states that the size of the board will be a maximum of 25 people. I believe that the full 25 are needed for the L.L.T.T., because it is a large and diverse area. (A/102)</p> <p>The SLF considers that the size of the Park Board should be the maximum of twenty-five, given the size of the proposed area and its demographic make-up.(J/0194)</p> <p>As the first National Park and one that may include such a large and potentially diverse area, a Board of maximum size seem appropriate. As experience develops, it may be possible to operate with a smaller board (O/0013)</p>
Support for less than 25	A/0068, A/0098, A/0133, A/0185, A/0319, H/0145		A/0066, A/0111, A/0204, C/0063, K/0290, M/0048	12	<p>The suggested Board is too big for effective working. It should have eight members nominated each by the Ministers and Local Authorities and of these six each should be locally resident, and four members elected directly by the residents, who shall live and work directly in the landward or village areas of the Park, not in the towns at the edges.(A/0111)</p> <p>RSPB Scotland believes that the size of the Board should be restricted to 15 in order to make the Board effective. We propose that the 15 should be appointed on the basis of a 5:5:5 ratio of directly elected, local authority nominated and those appointed by Scottish Ministers.(K/0290)</p>
Support for more than 25	A/0166, A/0319, O/0127		A/032, A/204	5	<p>I am not sure it was sensible for the Act to set a rigid upper limit of 25 membership of National Park Boards. To allow some flexibility a range of (say) 25 - 30 would have been preferable, permitting up to 10 directly elected members if desired. With only 5 for the entire Loch Lomond and</p>

					Trossachs National Park it is more than likely that sparsely populated fringe areas, some of which face the biggest problems in terms of transport and accessibility to various services, will be very inadequately represented. (A/0166)
Other comments	A/0255, A/0319, D/0171, D/0172, D/0202, D/0225		A/0204, M/0048	8	<p>One strong, independent, Scottish Executive nominated chairman of appropriate standing and experience (A0255).</p> <p>This is a key appointment and it is vital that the person filling this position is widely knowledgeable about the purposes for which the park has been established. The Association would have preferred that Scottish Ministers chose the convener from among the members appointed by them as having knowledge or experience relevant to the functions of the Authority or the Park.(M/0048)</p>

Question 14: Number of directly elected members					
Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for 5 directly elected members	A/0185, A/0280, D/0326, E/0226, H/0261, K/0094, K/0180	B/0136	A/0039, A/0057, A/0112, A/0134, A/0157, A/0168, A/0328, B/0285, C/120, C/0175, D/0277, E/0122, E/250, E/0289, E/0301, F/0119, F/0235, G/0186, H/0069, H/0195, H/0340, K/0273, K/0294, K/0290, K/0311, O/0078, O/0259, O/0270, L/0100, O/0114	38	<p>I agree with the number of Board members being set at 25, with five of these being directly elected but would like to see in the designation order some form of control on the Council appointees in order that there could be a very local representation higher than the defined five. This would go some way to answering the queries raised about local input rather than control being away from the area. (A/0280)</p> <p>It is also recommended that the number of directly elected Members should be the minimum of 20% (5) leaving 10 Members being appointed by Scottish Ministers and 10 to be nominated by local authorities. (E/0122)</p> <p>We also feel that 20% of the members should be directly elected. These five members, combined with the 10 nominated by the local authorities, should ensure that full account is taken of local concerns. The Partnership recognises that this is a <i>National Park</i> and suggests that the proposed 10:10:5 split is probably the optimum which can be achieved to combine representation of national and local interests and to bring on board the widest range of necessary experience, wisdom and expertise. (H/0069)</p>
Support for a number of directly elected members equal to local authority and SM appointments	A/0102, A/0138, A/0191, A/0206, A/0255, A/0319, C/0187, D/0172, D/0225, D/0351, O/0127, M/0062, P/0292	D/0056, D/0091, D/0320, L/0103	A/0040, A/0220, B/0021, C/0223, D/0162, D/0202, F/0072, F/0303, J/0233	26	<p>I believe that significant local representation is vital to manage the Park for the cultural and environmental benefits of the area. It is also important to maintain non-political management, unlike the existing local authorities. Local representatives will bring an intimate knowledge of the area to the board and a non-political attitude to management. This is clearly seen in all community councils throughout the region. Henry McLeish has stated that we should "bonfire the quangos". He should start with this National Park Board. I believe that the local representation should be more than 20%, and that there should be an <u>equal</u> one-third representation from communities, the local authorities and the Scottish Executive nominations (A/0102).</p> <p>Seven directly elected members that would give us seven wards. Callander could be a single ward and the remaining six to be wards of approximately 1000 + or - which I think is a fairer distribution. Eight to local authorities.</p>

					<p>Eight to Scottish Ministers (A/0191)</p> <p>I believe it is critical that the Park Board should have sufficient local members to ensure that the views of local residents are adequately expressed to the Board and the spectrum of local opinion fully communicated to them. To achieve this the number of "directly elected members" should be increased to 10 making the total Board membership 30. Five of the "directly elected five candidates for election nominated by the Association of Community Councils in the Park area. The local authorities should nominate 10 members and the Scottish Ministers should appoint 10 members in addition to the 10 "directly elected members". (O/0127)</p>
Support for 50% or more directly elected members	A/0065, A/0068, A/0058, A/0098, A/0104, A/0199, A/205, B/0044, B/0286, B/0287, B/0288, B/0317, C/0200, C/0238, D/0316, J/0198, L/0297, P/0292		A/0221, A/0247, C/0063, J/0194	22	<p>The 20% (5) directly elected members is insufficient and puts residents at an immediate disadvantage. Adding the 5 local (in terms of the Act) council representatives of doubtful allegiance brings this up to 10. Let's get back to the original 50% of the Bill. Since 50% of 25 would mean destructive surgery on some member. I suggest 52% - that is 13 directly elected members on the Board (A/0068)</p> <p>We are concerned that only 20% of the National Park Board will be directly elected representatives. We consider that there should be at least 50% directly elected representatives with the remainder being from the Local Authority or appointments by the Scottish Ministers. Without sufficient local representation from people living and working in the area, the National Park Authority may seem to be autocratic and out of touch. (B/0044)</p>
General support for more directly elected members	A/0081, A/0107, A/0164, A/0166, A/0191, B/0077, C/0239, C/0141, D/0099, D/0148, D/0171, D/0315, P/0292		A/0032, A/0147, A/0220, A/0247, B/0310, C/0061, C/0063	20	<p>This is of particular concern for Ben Vorlich and Loch Earn. It is fundamentally different in character so local representation will be very important. It must be questioned how good that representation will be since most of the time will be spent discussing other areas within the core Loch Lomond and Trossachs area. Who will want to serve on a Board dealing with non-local issues? Greater accountability will be achieved through a local solution. (B0310)</p>
Concerns about local authority nominations	A/0058, A/0065, D/0200, M/0062		G/0186	5	<p>I cannot see how elected Councillors, particularly those living in an urban environment, can possibly fulfil this function. Their knowledge of the sort of lives and livelihoods that country people aspire to might well be inadequate for the task. This aspect will need to be handled sensitively as those of us</p>

					<p>who live within the rural areas of the park will be the most important stakeholders and may not be properly represented. (A/0058)</p> <p>I worry about local councillor representations as they are elected on a broad party political platform and then selected to sit on various functional committees. In other words the local councillor delegates on the NP board may not necessarily have a keen interest. Directly elected representatives are in my view more likely to have this commitment thus benefiting local communities and businesses. (D/0200)</p>
Links to election order	D//0171, D/0351, L/0201		A/0112, A/0249, C/0063, L/0332, O/0013	8	<p>The precise number of directly elected members should depend on the final boundary determined for the National Park so that each represents a specific, defined area or 'ward'. Where possible, these 'wards' should be comparable in terms of population and area, and reasonably homogeneous in character. As an initial proposal (without knowing details of population etc.): (1) South and west Loch Lomond, Upper Glen Fruin, (2) Trossachs, north-east Loch Lomond, (3) Arrochar, upper Loch Long, Arrochar Alps, Argyll Forest Park (if included), (4) Tyndrum, Crianlarich, Glen Dochart, Killin, (5) Strathyre, Lochearnhead, Balquhidder, (6) Callander, Menteith Hills, Lake of Menteith (if included, (7) Strathendrick, Drymen, south-east Loch Lomond.(C/0063)</p> <p>Five persons to represent the local residents is a small number and would be inadequate should the decision be to extend the boundaries of the Park beyond the core area. It also needs considerable clarification. As it stands at the moment all five members could come from the one area. We would prefer to have a "ward" system with five wards and a member from each ward elected. (D/0171)</p> <p>It is not only the residents in the park area who need representation, but also those who have a legitimate interest as regular park users with a stake in the future of the area. There will be a clear need for membership organisations based in the Park for sports such as angling, sailing, canoeing and hill-walking to have a representative voice within the park authority. Holiday residents who own chalets and cottages, but do not reside permanently, should also have a vote. (L0201)</p>

Comments on overall framework	A/0106, A/0133	A/0353	A/0057, C/0063, A/0066, A/0111, A/0204, O/0259	9	<p>A figure of 25 members has been mooted, it seems to me this number is not required. A chief executive would be adequate to run this operation with non executive people appointed by him. This would make him totally accountable with no possibility of passing the buck. Alternatively, the board would consist of a majority of people living within the park boundary with only one council member from each council in the Park. The area has been run by various Councils and if this had been successful then there would be no need for change. Keep out council domination. (A/0133)</p> <p>The whole area of the National Park should become a new local authority, with all the powers and election procedures in addition to those required for the National Park Governing Board, which functions should be performed by the new council (A0204).</p>
Other comments	A/0058, D/0171			2	<p>It will be necessary to ensure openness and we suggest that while this does resemble a quango it can be overcome by the regular publication of the attendance figures of all members, together with a safeguard that local elected members and those members belonging to local Councils indicate that they have voted in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the people they represent rather than a personal or political opinion. (D/0171)</p> <p>I have no strong views on the 20% or 25 membership figures at this stage, but wish to make one point. It is extremely important that decisions on the Parks are taken with the full agreement of elected members. As they are very much the minority the constitution has to be drafted in such a way that their opinions, and those that they speak for, are not overruled by majority vote. (A0058)</p>

Question 15: Views on the approach to local authority nominations proposed, and on alternative approaches that could be envisaged

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for general approach			A/0189, C/0120, E/0345, J/0194, K/0294, K/0231, N/0243, O/0078, K/0150	9	<p>With regard to the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan Joint Committee, it is anticipated that a local authority nominee from West Dunbartonshire Council will ensure that recognition will be given to strategic planning on the board of the National Park. It is recommended that no specific representations should be made by the Joint Committee, but it is stressed that the inclusion of West Dunbartonshire Council is also in recognition of our strategic responsibilities as exercised through the Joint Committee. (E/0345)</p> <p>The approach to local authority nominations ought to reflect the share of the area and population included in the area. This will add to appropriate and democratic representation. However, whatever the final breakdown of local authority representatives, the important matter is that each nomination must have appropriate knowledge and experience of the issues they will encounter. Direct involvement will benefit the National Park Authority and, therefore, local authority nominees ought to be 'local' in every respect as far as possible (J0194).</p>
Support for 4:3:2:1	K/0180		A/0220, E/0266, K/0298, L/308	5	<p>Including Perth and Kinross the ratio should be 4:3:2:1 as outlined. It should once again not be a political tool to keep Stirling with 5 seats rather than include an area desperate for some uniform management. This is a national thing, not a private venture for some Council leaders (A0220).</p> <p>We agree with the proposed composition of the NPA, with Perth and Kinross being represented to reflect our view that Loch Earn should be included. (K/180)</p>
Support for 5:3:2	H/0261		A/0009, A/0134, C/0175, E/0122, E/0250, K/0311, N/0332	8	<p>I am not in favour of including Perth & Kinross, so go for the 5:3:2 solution (A0009).</p> <p>In the context of the comments above on the exclusion of Perth & Kinross's area, the nominations should be in the form of 5:3:2, which in practice has proved equitable and effective. (E0250)</p>

Comments on West Dunbartonshire share	A/0068		E/0122	2	However, should the final boundary include a part of Perth and Kinross Council, then West Dunbartonshire Council is adamant that its representation should not drop below two nominations. (E/0122)
Comments on Argyll and Bute share	K/0094	K0150	E/0301	3	Whilst population is only one of the possible measures for determining the number of local authority nominations for each constituent area, regardless of whether or not Perth and Kinross is included in the Park, Argyll and Bute's number is likely to be three and this would be acceptable. (E/301)
Comments on Perth & Kinross share			F/0268	1	Because the Park is to be the planning authority, it is vital that Perth & Kinross has a member, who I assume would probably be the local elected member for that St Fillan area. (F/0268)
Other approaches suggested	A/0191, A/0255, A0391	A/0353		4	If my proposals were adopted, I would go for:- 4 Stirling, 3 Argyll, 1 Dumbarton. If Argyll Forest Park were included I would still stick with this. If the SNH recommendation in 3.41 was adopted of 10 local Authority members and Argyll was excluded, I would go for 5:3:2. (A/0191)
Comments on local authority nominations			A/0040, D/0162, O/0270	3	<p>I wonder if the quota of Local Government nominations places much stress on the appointment of Councillors? With a number of Local Authorities having an interest in the Authority, how can a balance of people with different skills, knowledge and experience access the whole of the local authority nomination quota be assured? Given the range of interests and experience being looked for from the Board I think that Councillors are too narrow a pool from which to draw some of those skills. (A0040)</p> <p>The question has been raised as to whether the local authority nominees must be selected from elected local authority members or otherwise. We believe they should be elected members and that this should be made entirely clear. (D0162)</p>

Question 16 : Views on the potential areas of knowledge and expertise of nominations by local authorities and appointments of Scottish Ministers

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
General support for areas of knowledge and expertise	A/0191, A0199, D/0171, D/0202, D/0351, H/0261, M/0062	D/0320	A/0189, A/0220, A/0328, E/0122, E/0301, G/0186, H/0069, K/0290, K/0294, L0296, L/0311, L/0308, M/0048, K/0231, N/0155, N/0263, N/0300, N/0323, O/0259, O/0348	28	<p>The areas outlined cover all the aims well and should be kept. (A/0220)</p> <p>No list of desirable qualifications can ever be exhaustive but the one shown on pp25 and 26 of the consultation document is comprehensive enough for all practical purposes. (H/0069)</p>
Support for expertise on Aim 1)	A/0174, D/0172		A/0033, D/0315, E/0250, G/0336, K/0129, K/0208, K/0290, K/0257, L/0296, L/0308, N/0243, O/0078, O/0114	15	<p>Appointments by Scottish Ministers to the board should ensure provision of expertise on the historic environment. Again the Society urges the appointment of a National Park Archaeologist to ensure that the archaeological and historic sites and landscapes are managed effectively and comprehensively. (K/0208)</p> <p>The important Sandford principle has been reduced by the Executive and Parliament, against consistent advice...These weaknesses in the enabling legislation make it of paramount importance that those who are appointed should possess, as you put it in 3-45, a strong commitment to the overall purpose of National Parks. Special expertise and knowledge is important too, of course, but must be considered a secondary virtue.(L0296)</p> <p>Nevertheless we do want to emphasis that the whole purpose of national parks derives from a desire to safeguard the nation's outstanding landscapes, wildlife quality and recreational value. There should therefore be a substantial presence of persons reflecting these aspects in the final make up of the Board. (L0308)</p> <p>In my opinion there is one important omission from the list of interests and experience which it would be desirable for Board Members to cover, under the heading "Aim (a) - to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural</p>

					heritage of the area" This could be listed as "terrestrial and aquatic ecology". It seems to me that this is a field of great importance for a National Park Board, and that the reference to "biodiversity and earth heritage" does not adequately cover it. (O/0114)
Support for expertise on Aim 2	A/0206, B/0077, B/0288, B/0317, B/0125, B/0211, B/0286, J/0095	A/0353, B/0090, D/0056	A/0032, A/0033, E/0054, G/0126, H/0055, H/0254, H/0338, J/0194, J/0233, K/0294, N/0337, O/0224	23	<p>In particular, land managers working in the area must be adequately represented. Two practical working farmers should be appointed as technical specialists as these are the people who will be managing a large portion of the area. (A206)</p> <p>The Park Authority will provide an enhanced level of integrated management. If this intention is to be fulfilled, then the composition if the Authority must contain a representative number of current land managers at all times. (B0317)</p> <p>Because of the relative importance of woods and forests within the proposed Park area, it will be important to ensure that there is appropriate expertise on the Board to cover this interest. While the Consultation Paper refers to "timber production", we think this is too narrow and that "forest management" would be better. We consider that the ideal Board member would have broad forestry expertise, covering all facets of multi-benefit forestry (including, for example, forest recreation, conservation and landscaping as well as timber production). Local experience would also be a considerable advantage. (G/0126)</p> <p>We also recommend that any future Park Authority has at least one member whose skills include knowledge of deer management. (J0055)</p> <p>It is also suggested that two of the Governing Board Members have specific responsibility, one for water management (including recreation, zoning, speed, noise pollution and erosion), and one for land-based activities. (J/0095)</p> <p>In view of the numbers of anglers who make use of the angling facilities in the proposed area and of the fact that anglers pay for the privilege of fishing. I would hope that there would be satisfactory provision for direct</p>

					<p>representation for anglers on the Park Board.</p> <p>I consider it necessary that a fishery representative is appointed to the Park Board. On balance it would probably be most logical for such a representative(s) to be appointed by Scottish Ministers rather than by election. As District Salmon Fisheries Boards are the only statutory fishery management organisations in Scotland, I think it appropriate that they are represented on the Board. Within the proposed area there are several boards (Eachaig, Forth and Tay). There is currently no constituted board for the Lomond system. I consider there must be at least one fishery representative on the Park Board who represents the views of these District Salmon Fishery Boards. (H/0254)</p>
Support for expertise on Aim 3	A/0139,		A/0033, A/0188, G/0228, G/0304, L/0100, L/0218, L0271, L/0335	9	<p>The primary role of the National Park is to preserve the area and to encourage people to use the area for recreation, while looking after the interests of the local population. We would hope that the make up of the Park Board reflects this, with as many as possible representing sport and recreation to ensure that these activities are at least maintained at their present level. (L0335)</p> <p>sportscotland considers that there should be four or five members of the Park Authority who have knowledge and experience of recreation... there should be an equal mix of those who have knowledge or experience of active and formal recreation and those who have knowledge and experience of more informal recreation..... there will [also] have to be a balance between those having knowledge and experience of local recreational issues and those with knowledge and experience of national recreational issues (G/0228)</p> <p>We think it would be appropriate for one nominated person to in this group of three to have experience in land-based informal recreation and access and another to have experience in water-based recreation, but no one with sports expertise needs to be included (L0100)</p>
Support for expertise on Aim 4	A/007, B/0234, H/0145, P/0292		A/0221, C/0175, H/0190, H/0195, H0314, L/0296	10	<p>It is agreed the specific numbers of places should not be reserved for particular areas of expertise. In principle, Aim D (to promote sustainable, economic and social developments of the areas communities) should be</p>

					<p>seen as less important as local authority. Councillors will carry some of this expertise. (C0175)</p> <p>...the local business community should be adequately represented on the Park Authority. This would help ensure that an important section of the local community are represented and as a consequence the social and economic objective of the Park. The significant contributions made by the Social and Economic Reporting Group has highlighted the importance of engaging the business community in the future planning and management of the park. (H0314)</p>
Suggestions for other areas of expertise and knowledge	A/0007, B/0077, C/0184, C/0187	A/0353	A/0189, A/0328, C/0063, D/0099, G/0329, K/0156, K/0311, N/0155, N/0300, N/0323, N/0332, O/0259, O/0270	18	<p>... Security (police) (A/0328)</p> <p>We suggest that "<u>leadership</u>" should be added to the list of expertise. (B0077)</p> <p>..property management and property administration (C/0187)</p> <p>..renewable energy (E/0054)</p> <p>...Town and Country Planning. (G/0329)</p> <p>...some experience amongst Board members of National Parks elsewhere in the UK and abroad would also be valuable.(K/0311)</p> <p>.. professional architectural and landscape advice. (N/0300)</p>
Importance of Gaelic heritage		A/0018	A/0002, A/0010, A/0041, K/0022, K/0339, K/0064, K/0084	8	<p>I do not think that the system of nomination of Board members by Councils will give proper representation to the national aspects of the Park, as it seems to me to be biased towards local interests. I would therefore ask that consideration be given to the appointing of members with particular knowledge of the culture of the area and of the views of those who already regularly use the area for recreations such as mountaineering, sailing, canoeing, fishing and bird-watching. I very much hope that these points will be taken on board, and that an appointment will be made to the Park Board of someone with appropriate knowledge and experience of cultural heritage issues in order to ensure Gaelic is given its proper place in what is, after all,</p>

					<p>a <i>national</i> endeavour. (A/0018)</p> <p>I further recommend that the park's board or other supervisory body contain at least one Gaelic speaker and that this requirement be fixed formally, as is the case with the Crofters Commission and other bodies. (A0002)</p>
Representation for adjacent areas			A/0011, D/0060, E/0313, K/0150	4	<p>On representation I would mention that the area has for many years been essential recreational outlet for the people of Glasgow and indeed the city at one time owned the Ardgoil estate and land around Loch Katrine, as well as running the steamer service on the latter. It would seem to be wrong if the city were not represented on the park authority. (A0011)</p> <p>With regard to the proposed management arrangements, the Council has argued that membership of the managing body should be extended to include representatives from the surrounding areas, which would be most affected by the park. (E0313)</p> <p>Representatives from all these gateway settlements should be involved in the Park Board, as they are affected by decisions on such matters as housing, transport provision.... (K/0150)</p>
Support for including representatives of organisations on the Board	A/0065, H/0121	A/0353	D/0315	4	<p>Consideration should be given to appointees from such bodies as the Forestry Commission, DCS, National Farmers Union, RSPCA, RSPB, Scottish Landowners Association, Scottish Tourist Board, West of Scotland Water Authority and Police Authority. (A/0065)</p> <p>Whilst the Authority accepts that it would be inappropriate to reserve Board places specifically for public bodies or interest groups, individuals from these organisations should not categorically be excluded. Organisations like West of Scotland Water have staff with considerable experience in the subjects identified as being of particular relevance, who would be able to make a valuable contribution to the National Park Board. It would be regrettable if individuals with appropriate experience were excluded on the basis of their association with a particular organisation, particularly if local appointments had not secured personnel with expertise in a relevant subject. Similarly, individuals living within the Park boundary should not be excluded from appointment solely on the basis of their association with a particular</p>

					<p>organisation (H/0121)</p> <p>It is our view that members of the Board should be persons who have a love and a deep knowledge of the countryside and its wildlife, and it is our view that there ought to be members on the Board representing conservation bodies such as the National Trust for Scotland, the RSPB and the Scottish Wildlife Trust. (D0315)</p>
Support for excluding representatives from organisations from the Board	P/0292		A/0112, A/0134, G/0186, K/0298, K/0311, L/0296, L/0308, K/0231, N/0155, N/0243, N/0263, O/0114	13	<p>Board places should not be reserved for public bodies or interest groups, any such appointment would compromise the essence and purpose of the National Park. (A/0112)</p> <p>It is agreed that specific numbers of places should not be reserved for particular areas of expertise. In principle, Aim (d) should be seen as less important as councillors will carry some of this expertise. It will also be important to look for individuals with a range of knowledge who can take holistic view. (A/0134)</p> <p>Nominations should not be from organisations, and should reflect the range of experience required, including international, national and local perspectives. The NPA should avoid being parochial in nature. (K/0231)</p> <p>While the Society agrees that it would be unwise to reserve Board places for specific public bodies or interest groups , we would suggest that the designation order might include the list of potential areas of expertise with a wording to indicate that it is expected that these should be covered as far as possible. It will also be important to look for individuals with a range of knowledge who can take a holistic view and clarify whether substitutes will be allowed for nominated experts unable to attend meetings. (O/0309)</p>
Comments on expertise of local authority nominations	A/0143, K/0094		A/0066	3	<p>I would hope the Local Authority representation would be structured so that each Council had one elected member on the authority and that the other local council places were filled with officials from their finance, education and social services departments which would broaden the outlook of the authority (though not involve it in responsibilities for these services) and thus provide a means of immediate communication of common understanding of those aspects in the park area. These council officials as well as LEC</p>

					<p>officers, would be knowledgeable in requirements of Aims Two and Four for the establishment of the National Park. (A0143)</p> <p>We assume that there will be some restrictions on nominations from the local authorities, for example to exclude employees of the local authority. (K0094)</p>
Comments on the skills of Board members	A/0007, A/0068		A/0134, C/0175, G/0304, K/0273	6	<p>We are however concerned that the make up of the Board might be inflexibly divided into the skills listed in the consultation document. The principles behind the Park must include the ability to integrate all the objectives. We would see it as essential, for instance, that there is not a sub-group within the Board that deals with the sustainable use of the natural resources of the area that does not include environmentalists and community development expertise alongside the proposed land managers. We stress the need for the skills available and how they are used should be as crosscutting as possible. (K/0273)</p> <p>It will also be important to look for individuals with a range of knowledge who can take holistic view. (A0134)</p> <p>Do we really need experts on the Board? I would have thought that specialists would be better placed in a sub-tier advising the Board. Members of the Board need not be specialists but should have a sound educational background to enable them to look with a critical eye at what they are given. (A0068)</p>
Comments on commitment of Board members			A/0051, G/0186, G/0228, K/0273, K0294, K/0311	6	<p>WWF welcomes the intention, outlined in the consultation, that NPA Board members, whether elected or nominated and whatever their skills, must have a commitment to the purpose of the National Park. (K/0273)</p> <p>sportscotland considers it of vital importance that those on the Park Authority must represent the best interests of the park and not the interest of a particular sector or organisation that they may represent. It is noted that para. 3-46 of the proposal states that it is essential that members of the authority have a strong commitment to the overall purpose of the national park. sportscotland fully support this statement and suggests that is made strongly and obviously in the designation order for the LLT National Park.</p>

					(G/0228) There is a case for limiting the term of office of board members to e.g. ten years. This would prevent stagnation of policy within the authority and limit the potential for the excessive influence of special interests on policy and planning decisions. (A/0051)
Comments on the independence of Board members	A/0053, A/0104, A/0170, A/0185, P/0292	A/0279	C/0175, F/0303, N/0155	9	<p>I would prefer that Chairman of the Management Committee to be truly independent person, that is independent of politics, crown properties interest and large corporate interest. This would allay the fears and considerable disenchantment of both local residents and wider public, with the way these interests appear to be paramount in our lives at the moment, to the detriment of the best person for the job. (A/0170)</p> <p>As I understand the current proposals, the membership is entirely driven by geography, Council patronage and political affiliation. There does not seem to be much consideration being given to competence and this bears all the hallmarks of "The Dome". I am not stupid enough to fail to recognise that we live in the real world. However, it would be fair thinking if, at this stage, it was being proposed that the board would consist of the best 25 people we could persuade to run the Park, based on their competence, and not on where they live or their politics. (AOO53)</p> <p>The NPA therefore needs people of independent mind and sound judgement, of trustworthy integrity, to act as guardians of the natural heritage for tomorrow's generation. Scotland has a rich seam of such people outside of local and national government experience. The Hutchison committee itself had a goodly number, who would make sound guardians of the NP's natural heritage. (A0185)</p>
Comments on formation of sub-committees and advisory groups	A/0280, K/0094, L/0201		G/0228, G/0304, G/0336, L/0218, L/0271, L/0332, L/0135, O/0293, O/0324, P/0347	13	<p>Representation for people who use the area for leisure and recreation raises a problem but I would hope that with the establishment of Advisory Groups, similar to the Reporting Groups in being at the moment but possibly wider based on interests, would be the answer to this. (A/0280)</p> <p>It is recognised however that many sub-groups will be formed to implement the decisions of the Park Authority. It will be essential that appropriate</p>

				<p>representation from the police is included in these sub-groups, in particular in relation to visitor access and facilities and any community safety- related group. (P/0347)</p> <p>The capacity to form sub groups is expected to prove a useful resource in accessing specific expertise and the reporting of such groups through a chair with a position on the National Park Board was considered important. (L/0218)</p> <p>To redress that omission by creating sub-groups will only add to the bureaucracy. (L/0322)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Question 17: The Total Number of local members on the Park Board, and the number of these who should be nominated by local authorities and appointed by Scottish Ministers

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for 5 local members	A/0191, K/0094		A/0220, C/0120, E/0122, E/0250, K/0294, K/0311, L/0296, L/0308, K/0231, O/0114 O/0309, O/0348	14	<p>Five is okay but it could perhaps be increased because of the high percentage of rural area within the park and if it is not to become a living museum, their views are the most important ones. (A/0220)</p> <p>Given the maximum size of local authority membership it is likely that there will automatically be "local member" representation, and the requirement for 5 local members from the local authorities is accepted. However if the local authority representation is reduced, either through a smaller Board, or greater direct elections, then the requirements for the local authorities to provide all 5 "local members" may prove unduly onerous and counter productive, in that the "local members" may not be part of the administration. (E/0250)</p>
Support for more than 5	B/0288		C/0063, H/0190	3	<p>We note that the proposal allows for this but we believe that it should be a requirement that 75% of Park Board members live and work in the Park. This will help ensure local support and local accountability. (H/0190)</p>
Support for Local authorities to use local ward councillors	A/0102, A/0280, B/0113, B/0077, B/0286, B/0287, C/0187, D/0225, D/0277, L/0201	A/0151, D/0056	A/0111, A/0189, C/0175, E/0301, F/0119, O/0348	18	<p>It is understood that there are nine L.A. wards in the proposed area. It seems logical to simply take the L.A. councillors from these wards and put them onto the board. They have been elected by the people in the area, they are familiar with the area and many of them live in the area. The wards can also be used to select the local representation so that there is a fair geographical spread. (A/0102)</p> <p>I also hope that the various local authorities will nominate their elected councillors or community councillors from wards within the Park and <i>not</i> urban councillors with little or no knowledge of rural ways and practices. (A/0151)</p> <p>The consultation document does mention a rather woolly requirement for the members to "have knowledge and experience relevant to the functions of the National Park" and that there should be a minimum of 5 "local members" from amongst the nominees and appointees. We feel it is essential that where the Local Authority nominees are Councillors (probably all of them?)</p>

					<p>they should all be "local members" <u>in so far as is possible</u> and thus have some direct knowledge of and accountability to the park area. We would suggest therefore that Councillors from outside the area should not be nominated ahead of "Local" Councillors. We would find it quite unacceptable if the Local Authorities treated the board as a gravy train for urban Councillors from outwith the park following narrow party agendas. Surely Scotland's first National Park deserves better? (B/0113)</p>
Support for Local authorities to have some flexibility in their nominations	B/0288, C/0187, D/ 0171, D/0172, D/0225, D/0277, H/0261, L/0201		A/0134, C/0175, E/0301, E/0122, K/0290, K/0231, N/0332	15	<p>Our clients presume that in the majority of cases Local Authorities will tend to nominate existing Local Councillors. ... It is however hoped that Local Authorities may be "enlightened" enough to consider nominating others who may have particular expertise or knowledge of the Park Area but are not yet Local Authority Councillors. (B/0288)</p> <p>Council members would normally have part of their ward in the Park area. However, it is important not to be too restrictive since a suitable and interested Councillor might be adjacent. There should be flexibility otherwise suitable Councillors may be ineligible. (C0175)</p> <p>Local authority nominees should have local knowledge, and if Councillors must represent local wards (D/0172)</p> <p>It could be, of course, that more than five Members of the eventual Board will be "local". It is difficult for one authority to suggest how many of the local Members should be nominated by local authorities. It should really be for each Council to recommend this on the basis of the number of places it is allowed to nominate. On the basis that one of these should be for a "local Member" allowing the other to be filled by a non-local with knowledge and experience, such as the portfolio holder for Planning and Economic Development in the Council's Executive. (E/0122)</p> <p>For the Argyll and Bute nominations the order of preference would be: members from within the Park boundary first, members from within the Helensburgh/ Lomond and Bute/Cowal administrative areas second, and, members with relevant expertise third. (E/0301)</p>

					We believe that the Scottish Ministers and the Local Authorities should have flexibility as to who they appoint placing the emphasis more on what the member can bring to the Board rather than focusing on their address or seat as a Councillor. (K0290)
Comments on different frameworks	A/0174		A/0328, O/0259	3	No specific numbers but a ratio of 1:2:2 for "local members" : council nominations and Scottish Minister appointments to achieve local accountability (A0328)
Support for maximising national interests in SM appointments			A/0189, H/0069, K/0294, L/0335	4	Local authorities should be required in the designation order to make at least half (rounded up to a full number) of their nominations local members, thereby providing a fifth of the Board. This would not preclude Ministers from appointing local members, but would leave the maximum scope for them to appoint members representing the national interest (A/0189)
Comments on the importance of local knowledge			B/0310, J/0194, G/0186	3	<p>Locality stipulations for members could provide the required balance of interests, but there are some caveats i.e.: local members appointed by local authorities may see their role as defending local business interests against the development constraints imposed by the designation. Placing too much control in the hands of centrally appointed members (whether of local origin or not) may diminish the standing of the park authority in the eyes of locals. (G/0196)</p> <p>If possible, the SLF would argue that the total number of 'local members' on the Park Board must be maximised. Those who live in the National Park area, or who represent the people within that same area, will be most familiar with the issues involved and the concerns of those who live and work within the area - the very people most directly affected. All Board members must appreciate the need for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs to retain rural businesses and traditional industries, generating employment and incomes and the multipliers of prosperity. This requires investment induced by an enterprise culture. The 'local' dimension is vital to this. (J/0194)</p>

Question 19: The timing of direct elections in respect of selection of other elements of the Park Board

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for appointments being made after elections	A/0138, A/0191, B/0077, C/0187, D/0172, D/0277, D/0326, D/0351, H/0261, K/0094		A/0152, A/0189, E/0122, E/0266, E/0289, E/0301, G/0186, G/0228, G/0304, G/0336, K/0273, K/0284, K/0290, K/0294, K/0298, L/0308, K/0311, L/0218, L/0271, L/0296, L/0322, M/0048, K/0231, N/0263, O/0078, O/0114, O/0293, O/0309, O/0324	39	<p>Elections for the directly elected members are conducted. After the outcome of this, Local Council nominations are made to the Scottish Ministers. The Scottish Ministers, by then having approximately two-thirds of the Board membership before them, can choose appropriate people to balance the skills and experience base of the board. (A/0191)</p> <p>We suggest that the election of "direct" members should be carried out <u>before</u> nominations by Local Authorities and by Scottish Ministers. This will give Local Authorities and Scottish Ministers the opportunity to select from unsuccessful candidates of direct election, if appropriate. (B/0077)</p> <p>The Council sees it as appropriate for the elections to be held prior to the completion of the appointments and nominations as, in that way, a best match can be made between the experience and knowledge of those elected and of Members thereafter appointed. (E/0122)</p> <p>It is considered that Ministerial appointments should take place after both direct elections and nominations by local authorities, since Ministers will need to ensure that the requirement of 20% local membership is achieved out of their share of the appointments. They cannot control who is directly elected and it is up to local authorities to nominate who they choose, provided they meet the knowledge and experience criteria set out in the Act. (E/0266)</p> <p>It is likely that some of these interests, particularly those of land and water management and food and timber production, will be found amongst the locally elected members and in persons nominated by the local authorities. There may, therefore, be some benefit in the Scottish Ministers appointments being delayed until the mix of interests in the other appointments is known, in order to allow for securing a good balance in the overall composition of the Authority. (M/0048)</p> <p>We consider that the elections for the directly elected members should</p>

					<p>precede the nominations from Local Authorities and direct appointments by Scottish Ministers, since it is only after assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the directly elected members that appropriate appointments can be made by the Scottish Ministers. However we could not wish the setting up of the National Park to be delayed due to the direct elections. If the balance of knowledge on the Authority is not correct initially, this could be corrected in the early years, by varying the periods of appointment of appointed members, (both local authority nominated appointments, and those directly appointed by the Scottish Ministers). (K/0094)</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 a fixed intervals to ensure simplicity and a good turn out for the NPA elections. Only after the elections should local authority and ministerial nominations be made to allow complementary skills to be built up in the Board. (K/0273)</p> <p>Elections should precede nominations such that (a) persons elected are not also nominated and (b) local and national nominations can take into account the expertise of elected members. (O/0293)</p>
Supports for appointments being made before elections	A/ 0065, D/0202		A/0009, A/0111, B/0310, E/0250, O/0013	7	<p>Elections of local members should follow appointments in order that the composition of appointee members can be appropriately counterbalanced. (A0065)</p> <p>Again, this depends crucially on the method of election to be used. If the election allows the whole electorate to vote for a number of candidates, then the direct election should follow all the nominations, allowing the electorate to select those required to reflect or strengthen views that they consider not to be adequately represented by the nominated members. On the other hand, if the elections are to be on a very local basis, or to be on a "winner-takes-all" basis in discrete areas, there is a stronger case for the nominations to come after the election to enable significant but under-represented views to have a voice. However, since there is always the risk of the nomination process being seen as overriding the democratic will of the people, allowing the electorate to have the final say seems the better option.</p>

					In particular, this avoids the possibility of an individual rejected by the electorate being subsequently nominated. There may be very good reasons for that happening, but it always leaves a bad taste . (O/0013)
Support for appointments being made at the same time as the elections	A/0138, D/0171	D/0091	A/0111, A/0134, C/0175, H/0069	7	<p>It is important that all appointments to the Park Authority take place at the same time - so that the Authority can form a cohesive group. Flexibility will occur over time with local government changes and reappointments. (A/0134)</p> <p>If the Park Board is to be seen to be democratically accountable the majority of its members must be elected either directly or as local authority councillors whose wards fall wholly or partly within the National Park. However it may not be possible to achieve this on a pro-rata basis for 4 local authorities and 9 wards. There is no guarantee that such a requirement would be met, since, under the legislation local authorities may nominate councillors from wards outside the Park or, indeed, make unelected nominations. A solution to the problem of democratic accountability could be for all local authority representatives to be elected by the residents of the National Park at the same time as the directly elected members. Each local authority would nominate a list of its preferred candidates from which its voters would be able to choose, ideally a ratio of 1 from 3. So, for example, if Stirling had 4 seats on the Park Board it would nominate 12 candidates from which residents within the Park and within Stirling Council wards would choose. Provided local authority nominations are chosen accordingly, the suggested election procedure should not harm unduly the objective of ensuring the necessary range of knowledge and experience on the Park Board. (A/0138)</p> <p>We would prefer that the designation order should allow the timing of the direct elections to allow for the NPA to be formed as a complete unit and that local elections should not be considered as an after thought. (D/0171)</p> <p>The Partnership feels that the fairest timing would be for the nominations to be announced at the same time as the results of the direct elections. In that way the electors, Scottish Ministers and local authorities can all make their choices without being influenced by the others. If that is not possible or</p>

					acceptable, then the elections should be held after the nominations are known, so that when local people vote they may do so with as much knowledge as possible. This sequence of events will maximise the influence local people will have on the operation of the Park. (H0069)
Support for direct elections after local authority appointments	H/0121		O/0270	2	Timing of appointments: LA appointments, then local members, then Ministers appointments to achieve balance. (O/0270)
Other comments	J0198		A/0330, A/0328	3	The timing of direct elections should ensure that there is a sequence of replacement and the Nolan principles are observed. (A/0328) Direct elections should not be at the same time as local authority elections, to minimise political influences, and should preferably be by postal ballot. (J/0198)

Question 19: Views on the name of the National Park

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Support for 'Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park'	A/0133,A/0166, B/0077 B/0154, C/0187, D/0171, D/0277, D/0326, E/0122, H/0261, K/0094	D/0091	A/0009, A/0033, A/0040, A/0134, A/0168, A/0207, A/0220, A/0221, A/0249, A/0328, B/0310, C/0063, C/0120, C/0175, D/0076, E/0250, G/0126, G/0329, G/0336, H/0069, K/0212, K/0294, K/0163, K/0284, K/0290, K/0298, K/0311, L/0271, L/0308, L/0322, N/0155, N/0243, N/0300, O/0114, O/0259, O/0348	48	<p>Even with the inclusion of various fringe areas in the National Park for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs, I can suggest no alternative preferable to this name. I have in mind too, that the Snowdonia National Park covers much more than Snowdonia itself.(A/0166)</p> <p>The Estate's view is that the National Park should be limited to the geographical area of Loch Lomond and the Trossachs and therefore the name should remain unchanged.(B/0310)</p> <p>On the name of the National Park, we would recommend that the current "working" title is acceptable, even if the area were to be extended and would not wish any change.(D/0091)</p> <p>Stirling Council considers that the Park should be called "The Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park." (E/0250)</p> <p>While Members considered an amendment which proposed that the name Loch Lomond National Park be applied, the motion that "Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park" be promoted as the most appropriate name was agreed on a large majority. (H/0261)</p>
Support for 'Loch Lomond National Park'	A/0068, A/0191, A/0199, A/0205, A/0278, A/0280, B/0317, D0153, D/0172, D/0202, D/0351, J/0198, K/0094, J/0095, A/0139, A/0260, M/0062		A/0093, A/0105, A/0147, A/0222, D/0162, E/0301, L/0130, K/0343	25	<p>I suggest the name of the Park should be "The Loch Lomond National Park." The reasons for this suggestion are that: this description is shorter and "punchier", Loch Lomond is more likely to be known on an international level than the Trossachs, the original concept was for a Loch Lomond Park, the proposed title will be a misnomer if other areas such as part of the Cowal Peninsular are included (and no - a longer title is not an option). (A/0205)</p> <p>This should be changed to "The Loch Lomond National ... this name is known everywhere, it is the centre of the area proposed above, any new area assimilated will have a link, and it will define the Park effectively. (D/0202)</p> <p>If, as seems likely, the new Park boundaries are to be extended beyond the</p>

					core area, the name of the park should simply be "The Loch Lomond National Park." There is no need to include the Trossachs in the name. National Parks elsewhere in the UK and abroad include identifiable districts whose names do not appear in the title of the national park. (L/0130)
Support for 'Lomond National Park'	B/0113		A/0189, A/0204, C/0306	4	The present name is unacceptably unwieldy, but it is difficult to find a concise and inclusive replacement,. If any of the 'strong' or 'weak' areas are included (it seems that there is a wide consensus for at least the Argyll Forest Park) they are quite a distance from Loch Lomond and/or Trossachs, so LL&T sounds less applicable. Ben Lomond is actually the most visible core element, it sits between the Loch and the Trossachs. So why not plain 'Lomond National Park'? (C/0306)
Support for a bilingual (Gaelic) name	K/0022, K/0042		A/0010, A/0041, E/0266, K/0339	6	As a national park and as a park area with a strong Gaelic heritage, the National Park should have an official name in Gaelic as well as English. (A/0041)
Support for other names which reflect the wider geographic area	A/0138, B/0317, D/0148, A/0065, M/0282	D/0056	A/0009 , A/0112, A/0169, C/0061, C/0240, C/0063, K/0231, M/0048, M/0282	15	Queen Elizabeth National Park or Prince Charles National Park (A/009) If it is to be a geographical name "Southern Highlands" is suggested. Alternatively, it might be appropriate to honour the memory of the Scot who pioneered the National Park concept: 'John Muir National Park.' (A/0138) Crisp and emphatic - Lomond-Trossachs-Cowal National Park. (A/0169) There are strong feelings about the name as not being a fair description of the whole land mass especially St Fillans. The main difficulty is with the name "Trossachs." With the launch of VisitScotland we feel that they should be arbiter of the title as they will be the main promotional tool in the UK and overseas. (M/0282)
Disagree with use of the name National Park	B/0211, B/0286, B/0287, B/0288, J/0198		A/0051	6	I would prefer to see the words "National Park" dropped from any designation of the area. Unfortunately to the majority of the general public these words conjure up the wrong impression! As you are no doubt aware there are precedents in England for areas designated as National Parks not including these words in their title. I would therefore wish to suggest that the area be known simply as "Loch Lomond & The Trossachs". (B/0287)

					<p>In this we were divided, the park should be known as The Loch Lomond National Park or the Loch Lomond Authority. There is proposition to the use of the words "National Park" and the example of "The Broads Authority" is quoted as a National Park which does not have this description in its title. (J/0198)</p> <p>"Loch Lomond and Trossachs Special Conservation Area." (A/0051)</p>
Other comments	A/0068		A/0105, A/0009, K/0231, K/0290, L/0218, L/0308	7	<p>I trust we will not be saddled with any dreadful composite name such as was foisted on our Tourist Board, ie. "Argyll, the Isles, Loch Lomond, Stirling & Trossachs Tourist Board." (A/0105)</p> <p>Whatever name is selected, the National Park stationery and publicity material should include the strap line - "Scotland's First National Park." (K/0231)</p>

Question 20: Comments on Costings

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
General comments on funding	B/0044, C/0187		A/0085, G/0228, K/0294, L/0308, E/0289, N0332	8	<p>The National Park will require adequate funding to succeed and the acceptance of this by the Scottish Executive is required. Adequate funding will show that the Scottish Executive fully supports the National Park. Any under funding will damage the presently vulnerable tourism industry, damage the local economy and environment, and damage further the very brittle agriculture industry within the affected areas. (C/0187)</p> <p>It will be important to ensure that spending is spread fairly throughout the park and is not seen to be concentrated in the core area. This will avoid accusations of preferential treatment from those on the periphery of the park. (G/0228)</p> <p>Scottish Executive Ministers must therefore be prepared to set a boundary for the Park which fully meets all the Park's needs; must give to the Park Board all the necessary powers, and, in respect of resources, must be fully committed to meeting the public finance needs in the whole Park area. In relation to the total land surface of Scotland this is a small area. Nevertheless, its importance in the history and landscape of Scotland is immense and, as Scotland's first National Park, it deserves all that is required to deliver the highest standards of planning and management. (L0308)</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. (A/0085)</p> <p>The establishment of the National Park will be funded directly by the Scottish Executive. There is a degree of concern that such funding will have an impact of Local Government funding, especially in relation to Ranger</p>

					Services, countryside planning, nature conservation etc. It is, therefore, considered important that the funding is "new money" and not taken from the overall settlement to Local Authorities and SNH, with resulting lowering of monies available to support existing countryside planning, recreation and nature conservation facilities and services. (E/0289)
Comments on the relationship between the funding and size of the Park	B/0317, J/0198,		C/0227, J/ 0194, J/0233	5	<p>The cost of Proposals do not appear to include a sliding-scale according to the land area included within the Park boundary. For example if all the area shown including strong-case and weak-case boundaries were to be included, specific items of expenditure such as provision of Ranger services could be increased by an order of magnitude. (B/0317)</p> <p>The budget for the Park Authority's expenditure should be commensurate with the scale of area within the boundary of the proposed National Park. (J0233)</p>
Comments on sources of revenue	A/0102, A/0065, P/0292		K/0156, E/0289	5	<p>We should approve Government's decision to fund the NP one hundred per cent and not burden the local authorities, and ask them to show a real commitment and provide additional finance for a Park that, in time, we can all benefit from and be proud of. (A/0102)</p> <p>It is noted that the project is to be funded from general taxation to the tune of £4.9m to £5.4m per annum. Judging by the turnout at the public consultation meetings this would mean financing by a population 98% of which neither cares about nor is involved in the National Park. It is considered that at least some of the funding should come from those who will most benefit from the project, possibly by a levy on the tourist industry within the Park area or some form of charge on visitors. (A/0065)</p> <p>A levy of, say, .01 to .1 pence per gallon should be charged for water extracted from Loch Lomond, the level of which has been increased at least twice for reservoir purposes. This should be enough to finance the running of the Park and improving facilities. Any suggestion of tolls, especially on the A82, has been vetoed as this is a commuter route to Glasgow. (K/0156)</p>
Suggestions for programme spend	A/0104, A/0138, A/0143, D/0148, H/0261, K/0094,		F/0303, G/0304, J/0194, K/0208, O/0348	12	Concern has been rightly expressed regarding the current road network within the proposed Park and its ability to cope with any significant increase in vehicular traffic. While this may be managed within the Park in various

	M/0282			<p>ways, road access to the Park, notably the A809 (Glasgow-Drymen) and A801 (Glasgow-Aberfoyle etc.) is already inadequate. Under present funding arrangements, upgrading of these roads would be a major burden on both Stirling Council and East Dunbartonshire. It is vital that appropriate provision is made by the Scottish Executive to ensure that these and any other major approach roads to the Park requiring up-grading are improved and maintained to an acceptable standard. (A/0138)</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements should be identified at this stage, which includes total signage of the whole area and villages within, adequate car parking and public toilets. These should be carried out in the first year of the National Park so that the project can have credibility. Therefore we feel the authority should be voted adequate funding to start and a three year rolling budget beyond. (D0148)</p> <p>There must be adequate traffic controls within the Park. At the moment it is almost impossible for the Police to control the excessive speeding of visitors and locals within the villages that lie within the proposed Park area so funds must also be available to the appropriate Police forces to this end (A/0104)</p> <p>In regard to capital expenditure, lessons should also be taken from the Interim Committee's ability to date to pursue projects unhindered by the problems of annuality. (H/0261)</p> <p>Many may argue that the raison d'etre for a National Park should be the creation and promotion of quality, applicable to all four aims. Therefore, the SLF considers that there should be provision for incentive, in order to secure the objectives of the National Park Plan. There needs to be an emphasis on quality to such an extent that investment in economic and social prosperity becomes essential. (J/0194)</p> <p>Although the costs of programmes for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs are only indicative at this stage, the areas covered do not include historic environment activities. The society urges the future park body to incorporate specific programmes of conservation and management of the historic environment in the National Park. (K/0208)</p>
--	--------	--	--	--

					No immediate provision has been made for research and monitoring of change in component ecosystems and the distribution of organisms. These activities must be seen as the essential basis for the understanding of the ecology of the area and for its proper management (O/0348)
Comments on staffing levels	B/0077		A/0111, J/0194	3	<p>There is no indication of how much of the proposed money is to be available for the ground or its inhabitants, only for experts and some hewers of wood and drawers of water. (98 posts after three years including planning, fundraising, interpretation and education, rural development, traffic management, + Rangers and countryside management: £2.4 million care costs + £1.5 - £2 million new programmes + £1 million today). In the French Regional Parks there were 3 new posts/1000 inhabitants - of whom 2/3 are outside Experts and a factor of 0.7 for additional commercial employment/business increase. (A/0011)</p> <p>We are somewhat concerned that the emphasis is on additional staffing costs not directly associated with active, quality visitor provision and management. There is a general fear that the National Park will lead to additional bureaucracy, which could result in the fragile local economy becoming unsustainable. We are disappointed to note that SNH have concluded that there might not be a need for a very significant increase in resources for capital works. The modus operandi for a National Park should be the provision and encouragement of <u>quality</u>, be it visitor services, accommodation, access, transport, and every other conceivable facility. There should also be adequate provision for incentives in order to secure the implementation of the Park plan. Emphasis should be place on "front line" services and certainly not stifling economic and social sustainability. (B/0077)</p>
Views that the funding proposed was insufficient	A/0104, A/0138, A/0174, A/0349, B/0262, C/0142, C/0200, C/0238, D/0148, D/0171, D/0202, D/0225, H/0145, H/0261,	D/0316	F/0303, H/0340, L/0218, G/0228, M/0282	22	<p>The proposed funding of the park is so weak that there is no visible advantage to any section of the community. (C/0142)</p> <p>The estimate of potential costs for the operation of a National Park are, with the greatest respect, hopelessly inadequate even allowing for the fact that the pricing estimates are at 1998 levels. The suggestion that we can have a properly, successfully and ambitiously (why not?) run National Park at a</p>

	L/0302, P/0292			<p>level of £5m to £6m per annum is simply not realistic. I have some experience of these matters as a Trustee of the Water of Leith Conservation Trust. We employ full time staff, volunteers, rangers etc., and are involved in a large (Lottery Funded) conservation project with clear cost parameters. In addition I have been involved with the Scottish Mining Museum Trust, Heritage Lottery Fund Project at Newtongrange and allied to my professional experience as a chartered surveyor I would suggest that once the Park is up and running it will cost about £1m per month to run. (C/0238)</p> <p>At SNH presentations it has become apparent that budgets are likely to be inadequate, and expert opinion should be sought to arrive at realistic budgets. (D/0148)</p> <p>We feel that the suggestion of £5.4 to administer the National Park will prove to be inadequate. It would probably be inadequate for the Core Area only, which is one of the reasons we are advising caution in the size of the Park. It is our first venture into National Parks and we want to be proud of it and to prove to the world that with a new Parliament and a new venture we can be the best. Even with the most experienced people estimating costs, it needs time and actual figures to be sure that all that requires to be done will be done well. Living here we are very conscious of the inadequacies of our infrastructure at the moment and visitors to the Park will want to see the best from the start. (D/0171)</p> <p>Comparisons with the aspirations of the Interim Committee would suggest an under estimation of financial provisions, particularly in regard to operating costs. The Interim Committee wishes to continue to work with Scottish Natural Heritage Officers to re-appraise spend projection prior to their submission of advice to the Scottish Ministers. These spend levels must reflect the demands placed on the national park as consequence of geographical area responsibilities, and also embrace the realities of factors such as VAT eligibility. (H/0261)</p> <p>The current proposal for staffing and other core cost appears adequate to sportscotland. The programme costs however given the scale of management and capital projects required, in sportscotland opinion is</p>
--	----------------	--	--	--

					considerably underestimated. Furthermore, it is considered that the balance between core costs and programme costs needs to be weighted more towards the latter. (G/0228)
--	--	--	--	--	---

Comments on other issues – general comments on the National Park

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Board membership & working	A/0205, A/0138, A/0139, A/0170, A/0172, A/0185, A/0199, B/0286, B/0287, B/0288, B/0294, C/0201, D/0171, D/0277, D/0099	A/0279, D/0091	A/0204, C/0175, G/0329, J/0194, K/0231, K/0273, K/0290, K/0294, L/0218	26	<p>Representatives of Community Councils should be able to attend and speak at any meeting but not vote. Any members of the public should be free to attend but not speak or vote. (A/0205)</p> <p>Nominations should not be from organisations, should reflect the range of experience required, including international, national and local perspectives. The NPA should avoid being parochial in nature. Local authority nominations must be elected members but do not have to live within the National Park. The key criterion for selection should be knowledge and expertise, not residency. This may precipitate a bias but not a requirement, in favour of NPA members whose wards fall wholly or partly within the Park. (K/0231)</p> <p>The SLF considers that local accountability is essential. The National Park and its economic and social development may yet be controlled by central and local government via appointees and nominations, rather than by local people accountable to the area they serve. This would not be in the interest of the aims of the National Park. (J/0194)</p> <p>My proposal is simply that the whole enterprise should be guided by experts at ministerial level without the threat of party political control. In effect, they should be like civil servants who are always there to propose the best way ahead under local conditions. I believe that the best way to achieve this is through the appointment of internationally respected figures with considerable experience of similar ventures abroad. Scotland is in a unique position to take advantage of knowledge hard won in other countries and to avoid the economic and environmental pitfalls that might arise from within a nationally circumscribed concern. It is an unfortunate fact that the political process along cannot guarantee that there will not be mistakes nor can it ensure that mistakes are rectified in the best general interest. A Board that pays heed to the best advice is bound to assume the stature of its experts and will be seen to be above the limitations of this process. Whatever the issues are in the context of the (A/0279)</p>

					<p>It was further suggested that wherever possible, the experts appointed directly by Ministers (40%) should be recruited locally ie. within the proposed area of the Park. This would increase the local input into management proposals, without diluting the expertise clearly necessary for the efficient running of the Park. This would also increase the perceived accountability of the VBoard, as these members would presumably be known to residents within the Park, and would be more accessible to them. (D/0099)</p> <p>I would prefer the Chairman of the Management Committee to be a truly independent person. <u>Reason:</u> This would allay the fears and considerable disenchantment of both local residents and the wider public, with the way these interests appear to be paramount in our lives at the moment to the detriment of the best person for the job. (A/0170)</p> <p>We believe also that Board members nominated from the local authority councils should be those who represent wards within the Park area or who have direct involvement in Park issues or activities based within the Park, and meet the necessary criteria of experience outlined in Para 3-45 of the Proposals. Some of these should be nominated to represent the views of membership organisations with premises in the Park, who as rate-paying bodies to the councils, should have a mechanism for providing a representative voice in the Park Board. (C/0201)</p>
Concerns over bureaucracy and increased delays in decision-making	A/0098, A/0106, A/0349, B/0077, B/0044 B/0262, B/0317, C/0142, C/0200, H/0145	A/0353, B/0027	A/0066, C/0061, C/0141, F/0034, G/0329, J/0194, K/0311, O/0078	20	<p>Inclusion within a National Park area must not lead to planing blight. The National Park planning function must be exercised having due regard to the promotion of sustainable economic and social development of the area's communities. Additional costs should be mitigated by grants or subsidies in order to provide incentive to further desired development standards. (B/0077)</p> <p>Creation of National Park status will result in yet another layer of bureaucracy being imposed on businesses within the Park area. Hill livestock farming which is a significant land use within the area is already overloaded with undue bureaucratic restrictions and any addition would be totally unacceptable. (B/0317)</p>

				<p>Cross-boundary equivalence: there is great pressure on farm businesses to diversify and any non-agricultural business on farmland comes within the planning constraints applying to other commercial businesses. The union does not want equivalent enterprises on either side of a Park boundary to be treated differently by the planning machinery. Where any extra conditions apply to farms within a Park area, there should be full compensation from Park expenditure. (J/0233)</p> <p>Care has to be taken to ensure that the Park's planning functions do not stifle enterprise or place difficulties in the way of economic ventures at a time when the rural economy is under severe pressure and being actively encouraged to diversify. Provided that there is balance representation on the Park Board, the planning function should present an opportunity to positively encourage those developments which will benefit the economy in a way which is compatible with the social and environmental aims of the Park. (N/0155)</p> <p>There is potential for trouble in the sub-division of strategic and local planning between Local Authorities and the National Park Authority. There could be a lot of time-wasting and unnecessary posturing as a result. We'd hope that in establishing procedures, considerable thought should go into how the arrangement will work in practice. Although there is a danger of excessive bureaucracy in requiring the National Park Authority to consult Local Authorities on all development plans, there is a greater potential danger, especially in the early years of the Park, and that is for damaging conflicts between Local Authorities and the National Park Authority: not being properly consulted is a likely source of such conflicts. It may, therefore, be best in this front-runner National Park to be cautious, until some case history has been built up. (O/0078)</p> <p>The planning authority must be single tier for communities both inside and just outside the boundaries of the NP. For example, if Strathfillan were just outside the boundary then the single tier must be either the local council or the NP but not both! A double tier process would slow down the development application process and cause great inefficiency and</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>frustration. (C/0200)</p> <p>If the Board is to have any success/credibility, it must avoid delay and confusion at all costs. It can only operate effectively with public approval and co-operation and if it is not to be seen as just another Quango it must demonstrate the dynamism and speed and clarity of thought stressed throughout this letter. (A/0066)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Comments on other issues – management of the National Park

Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Aims of the National Park	A/0058, A/0098, A/0166, B/0154, B/0317, C/0200, D/0171	B/0177, L/0103	A/0105, A/0146, D/0315, J/0194, N/0243, O/0078	15	<p>Conservation of the natural heritage has not been given the clear priority over other National Park aims which many consultees on the draft Enabling Bill had urged. (A/0166)</p> <p>For the four aims to be "pursued collectively" there must be full co-operation between the NPA and those who live and work in the area. (B/0154)</p> <p>The management body must have full planning powers but the policy of equal consideration on social and economic and environmental issues must be paramount: It would be unacceptable for environmental consideration to take precedence over, for example, economic ones thus raising development costs for businesses who have to compete in the open market. (C/0200)</p> <p>Finally, it is our view that the prime function of the park must be to preserve the rural way of life and reduce the migration of young people forced to leave the area for work. It must be remembered that the function of the park is to protect the culture and heritage of the area; the foundation stone of which is the people who have lived here in the past and present. (L/0103)</p> <p>In our response to the consultation on the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000, we suggested that the first aim, on conservation and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage, should be the principal aim, with the others as subsidiaries. The legislation has not taken this on board, but we hope that the Park Authority can make a strategic decision in this direction, and that the formal steps to establish the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park could prioritise aims. To us, it is evident that unless conservation is the top priority, the other aims are not sustainable. (O/0078)</p> <p>In addition, the Society is concerned that the requirement for conservation has not been given priority over the other aims. This ambivalence on the primacy of conservation, will not serve the Park well and indeed unless the prime reason for National Parks is recognised as conservation, why</p>

				designate them? (O/0309)
Future policies and management	A/0068, A/0102, A/0143, A/0166, A/0170, A/0174, A/0185, A/0245, A/0260 A/0280, B/0077, B/0161, C/0187, C/0201, C/0223, C/0238, D/0123, D/0171, D/0148, H/0121, K/0180, M/0282, O/0080	A/0203, A/0353, B/0027	A/0032, A/0040, A/0188, A/0105, A/0220, A/0221, A/0249, A/0252, A/0264 A/0341, C/0061, C/0141, C/0217, C/0240, E/0250, E/0289, E/0299 E/0330, F/0072, G/0126, G/0228, G/0230, G/0253 G/0329, H/0195, H/0241, H/0248, H/0254, H/0340, H/0347, J/0194, J/0233, K/0075, K/0212, K/0129, K/0208, K/0231, K/0246, K/0273, K/0284, K/0290, K/0294, K/0298, K/0311, K/0339, L/0074, L/0130, L/0067, L/0100, L/0135, L/0218, L/0271, L/0308, L/0322, L/0335, N/0300, O/0078	83 <p>The points I made were not only that there should be LEC funding which would be dedicated funding for promotions within the proposed park area but also that there might be set up a separate LEC devoted to the park area which could be staffed by secondment from the four LECs operating presently within what will be the park area and adjacent thereto. I consider it is important that appropriate small industries and activities area financially resourced as part of the national park culture in addition to tourist orientated promotions to produce an economically supportive community. This may be best done by an independent LEC for the proposed national park as such a LEC would provide also a financial check by a body committed to making the park area thrive. The LEC would of course operate alongside but independent of the park though it might have a seat on the authority. (A/0143)</p> <p>As one directly involved, I can say that the requirement is for existing by-laws to be adequately enforced, rather than additional by-laws being introduced. The ranger services of Forest Enterprise, the National Trust and the Regional/National Park should be combined to allow "joined up" management. (A/0205)</p> <p>Peaceful methods of water recreation eg. sailing, windsurfing, fishing, canoeing, kayaking, currently co-exist without problems on the waters of the proposed Park. This should continue and no one activity should be favoured to the exclusion of another. (A/0260)</p> <p>The Park Authority must establish a reputation for positive and creative action in the fields of planning, development and countryside access, rather than adopting a control mentality. (A/0353)</p> <p>Will development/action plans be drawn up by the Park Board for the future? We presume that these as well as development/planning control will be the mainstay of the Park Board's work. We would for instance be interested to hear whether the following options would be welcomed/rejected: (a) a funicular railway for Ban Lomond; (b) a Ban/speed restriction on power boats</p>

				<p>on Loch Eck, Loch Lomond, Loch Ard, Loch Vennacher, Loch Voil and Loch Lubnaig; (c) a mountain hotel at Rest-and-be-Thankful; (d) ski-ing development on Crianlarich mountains Ben More/Stobinian; (e) careful management/apartheid of mountain-biking/walking/forest-drive routes/trails; enforcement of same. (C/0061)</p> <p>In general, whilst in principle supporting management schemes that enhance safety and the enjoyment of the water environment by the majority, we will oppose any future actions by the Park Authority to unduly restrict activities on or in water, such as is happening in the English Lake District. This we would consider to be contrary to at least one of the aims stated in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000, namely "to promote ... enjoyment in the form of recreation ..." Note: BMIF Scotland will be pleased to offer any assistance, information, advice etc. that might be useful now or in the future to the Reporting Team, or to the Park Authority when this has been created. (C/0240)</p> <p>From the outset, strong guidance on building design and identity will be required. Such guidance regarding vernacular design may exist within the existing local authority policies for respective areas. This guidance may currently be being considered by the LL&T Interim Committee. Such guidance will consolidate and compliment the identity of the area. (E/0299)</p> <p>Of particular importance will be the provision of strong planning policies to ensure only appropriate development which is beneficial to the park occurs. It is hoped that these issues will be addressed and rigorously enforced by the relevant planning authority. (E/0299)</p> <p>Certainly, Indicative Forestry Strategies should be carried out by the NPA in consultation with the local authorities. Similarly, a number of other agencies and land managers should be stated to be expected to more than merely consult the NPA on developments outwith normal planning controls in a National Park, but to <u>work with</u>, not against, the authority to achieve greater environmental gains as set out in the National Park Plan, rather than constraints. A Plan that would achieve the best voluntary co-operation in this way would not be one that emphasises constraints. This principle</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>applies particularly to agri-environmental schemes for which farmers are applying for grants to the Scottish Executive, but also to approval of Forestry Grant Schemes by the Forestry Commission that may affect the landscape, leisure and recreation activity, and to Electricity Act proposals including hydro-electric schemes. Less contentious perhaps in this National Park than it will be in the Cairngorms, is the need for the Pa (K/0180)</p> <p>It was strongly felt that there should be no charge for access to the Park as is expected to be reflected in the Land Reform Bill. Charges should only be for facilities provided. (L/0271)</p> <p>It is important to the success of National Parks in Scotland that they have positive incentive powers as well as regulatory powers. As a specific example, the National Park could be used as an opportunity to pioneer the new arrangements we hope for under the access legislation and to develop new grants and schemes to enable and assist farmers and land managers to facilitate and encourage access to their land. The National Park should be responsible for devising access strategies and biodiversity action plans for its area. (L/0308)</p> <p>We are concerned that unless as strong commitment for research within the Park is built into the Park's foundation legislation, this need will be side-lined by what may seem to be more urgent priorities. (O/0078)</p>
Outlying areas	A/0068, A/0139, D/0123	A/0087, D/0124, D/0091, D/0320	A/0029, A/0057, A/0093, A/0152, A/0207, A/0220, A/0222, B/0310, C/0175, C/0306, D/0060 E/0122, E/0250, E/0289, E/0299, E/0301, E/0313, G/0329, H/0069, H/0190, H/0195, H/0241, J/0194, K/0075,	<p>40 The park, should it go ahead will be much publicised in the hope of attracting funding as well as increased visitor numbers. This publicity will, if Helensburgh is excluded, be responsible for side lining Helensburgh in the visitor's mind as being of no interest to visit or importance in the scheme of the park's management. The exclusion of Helensburgh and the surrounding area will, in my opinion, be unacceptably detrimental to all businesses and residents alike. (A/0029)</p> <p>The boundary should not be seen as a division between protected areas and non-protected of privileged and non-privileged areas. The boundary will have the same meaning as the current boundaries between local authority areas so that the responsible authority will be different on either side of the</p>

			<p>K/0150, K/0231 K/0273, K0290 L/0074, N/0155, O/0270, O/0293, O/0309</p>	<p>boundary. But there should be significant collaboration in many issues, such as planning and development, and any grants, donations or other assistance should be available on an equal level to people on both sides of the boundary (D/0123)</p> <p>The Council is committed to the Scottish Executive's social inclusion agenda and feels that the Park should bring benefits to those living in areas adjacent to the Park as well as those within it. Retention of Structure Plan powers will help ensure that benefits are shared beyond the Park's boundaries. (E/0122)</p> <p>With regard to the proposed management arrangements, the Council has argued that membership of the managing body should be extended to include representatives from the surrounding areas, which would be most affected by the Park. The Council would also anticipate being included as a consultee in appropriate cases if planning powers are given to the Park Authority. In addition, the Council would wish to see continue enhancement of visitor attractions and accommodation in the area around the Park in order to take pressure off the more sensitive parts of the Park itself. Finally, the Council is concerned about the possible adverse impact of increased traffic generation on the roads through East Dunbartonshire leading to the proposed National Park. Therefore the Council would wish to see some monitoring system set in place in which our own Roads Service could be involved at an early stage. (E/0313)</p> <p>The National Park Authority as well as being a Planning Authority will have the power to make byelaws to control activities within the Park area. This could result in pressures for development on the immediate boundaries of the Park and the increased recreational use of other countryside areas of Central Scotland if controls are introduced. There is a need, therefore for wide consultation on any proposed byelaws. Additionally, there is a need to consider carefully the appropriate planning policies to control/direct development pressures within the areas bounding the Park area. (E/0289)</p> <p>SEPA has a similarly worded duty under section 32 of the Environment Act 1995, as do the Water Authorities under their own statute. Whilst it is clear</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>that the responsibilities of the National Park Authority will ensure that it works to maintain and enhance the natural heritage value of the National Park area, there appears to be no onus on the National Park Authority to ensure tht its actions are not to the detriment of the natural heritage of areas outside of the National Park. This might be most pertinent where rivers flow out of the Park or where a Park occupies part of a coastal sediment transport cell. In both of these circumstances, effects of management action in the Park might be manifested on natural heritage interests at considerable distances from the Park. A balancing obligation of the type described provides one mechanism for ensuring appropriate consideration of such issues. Should the National Park boundaries include any area of a marine SAC, it may be appropriate to designate the Author (G/0329)</p> <p>Wherever the boundaries are set there will be communities affected by the Park but not within it. It is of paramount importance that such places are not put at a substantial disadvantage because they do not have access to the Park's resources and development programmes. Their needs must be recognised in terms of funding for infrastructure, branding and other improvements. Special consideration will also need to be given in terms of planning and development control policy and implementation so that the transition from Park area to outside is not too abrupt. The neighbouring local authorities should ensure a partnership with the Park Authority so that there is no glaring disjunction between communities inside and immediately outside the Park. (H/0069)</p> <p>Additional resources for areas iwthin the National Park will enable "positive incentives and support for land management operations which contribute to the special qualities of the Area." It follows that areas outside will not have these additional tools for itegrated management and so will have a lesser opportunity to safeguard and enhance the natural heritage interests. (O/0270)</p>
Gaelic	A/0014, A/0053	A/0018	A/0002, A/0003, A/0005, A/0008, A/0010, A/0011, A/0041, A/0341,	19	As part of your stated aim "to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area", I would expect that all signage would be bi-lingual, that place names of Gaelic origin would be presented in their Gaelic form as well as in the anglied form, and that promotional and advertising materials, if not

			E/0266, F/0268, K/0022, K/0042, K/0064, K/0084, K/0165, K/0339		<p>totally bi-lingual, would have a Gaelic content or be available in a wholly Gaelic version. Where translation facilities are available in major European languages, I see no reason why Gaelic versions should not also be provided. (A/0018)</p> <p>SNH should hold a consultation meeting with national Gaelic development agencies and other members of the national Gaelic community to discuss the position of Gaelic in the national parks as soon as possible. (A/0010)</p> <p>I am writing to urge that SNH recommend to the Government that a Gaelic policy be established for the National Park. The order establishing the park should oblige the Board to draw up a Gaelic language policy. This policy should include bilingual signage, bilingual information and educational materials and a Gaelic medium ranger service for Gaelic speaking users of the park. (A/0041)</p> <p>...a National Park Advisory Group on Gaelic should be established. (E/0266)</p>
Transport and Traffic issues	A/0081, A/0104, A/0170, A/0139, D/0277 K/0180, L/0297		A/0011,A/0264, B/0310, C/0063, H/0347	12	<p>How would the authority for the park interact with Scotrail and indeed with bus operators in the area? There is no suggestion as to how the authority will handle visitor numbers and assist movement within the park, in such a way as to minimise the impact of visitor numbers on the environment of the area. (A/0011)</p> <p>Currently the area is essentially inaccessible to people without a car. This can only be resolved by having an internal park public transport system, which reduces the need for visitors to use cars, and for residential holiday provision to be located in closer proximity to existing communities, where services already exist and new visitor attraction will not threaten the natural heritage. It is important to include within the park area a sufficient vehicular communications network to enable a 'park' transport system to operate economically, and do the job required. (A/0139)</p> <p>In relation to road safety, the Park Authority will include many miles of major roads and the need for early and wide consultation on road buildig, signage etc., will be essential to maximise efforts to reduce road accidents within the</p>

					<p>area. (H/0347)</p> <p>Bearing in mind SNH's original comment in their first proposals report for LL/Trossachs that "traffic management is expected to be critical to the purposes of this National Park", the roads authority should be expected to liaise closely with the NPA in defining its roads strategy for the area. (K/0180)</p>
Fisheries	A/0131	A/0128	A/0032, D/0224, H/0241, H/0254, L/0067, L/0322	8	<p>Will existing angling clubs be able to continue to operate as before, or will their functions be subsumed into the administration of the Park? If the latter is the case, will there be some form of compensation? (A/0032)</p> <p>We have reservations about the small bits of the Tay catchment upstream of St Fillans and Killin being included in the Park area, as this might complicate discussion of Tay freshwater fisheries issues. (D/0224)</p> <p>Has the impact of the National Park on fisheries management been considered? If fisheries will be affected, then it is important that whole catchments are considered, there are obvious dangers in drawing boundaries short of these. Parts of several different river catchments are included within the proposed boundaries, and we therefore strongly advise that all the appropriate fisheries management bodies are consulted. By including the Argyll Forest Park, the tributaries feeding the wet side of Loch Lomond would be included, and there is obvious value in this. (O/0241)</p>
Minerals/Mining	A/0016, B/0117, C/0184, G/0046		A/0252, C/0334, G/0004	7	<p>I should have thought that there is a very strong case for stopping any extension of the quarry coming across the River Teith and that this part of the planning permission should be revoked. (A/0016)</p> <p>...the extractive industry does require greater clarification as to how extraction and related development proposals within parks boundaries would be managed. (C/0334)</p> <p>Cononish Farm. It is our clients' intention to develop the mine when economic circumstances permit, as its economic viability is obviously linked to the conditions of the gold market. Inclusion of the mine and its surrounding area in the National Park would at best deter potential investors</p>

					and thereby threaten the future of the project and its economic and other benefits for the Tyndrum area. Also, it would likely result in substantial loss to our clients which they would then seek to recover from the National Park Authority. (B/0117)
Deer Management	B/0125	A/0128, B/0027	H/0055	4	<p>A further consideration is that of deer stalking which supplies much of the income and also some employment in the remote areas. Almost the whole of Area 17 lies within the West Rannoch Deer Management Group area whose southern boundary is the Dochart. If Area 17 were included in the Park, the Park authority would be the authority for half of the WRDMG area, but not for the other half which lies to the north of Area 17. This would present an obvious possibility of conflict. (A/0128)</p> <p>Deer stalking is an important contributor to the economy of the estate but it could be jeopardised by any significant increase in hill walking activity resulting from promotion of tourism by the NPA. The loss of deer stalking would not only severely affect the viability of the estate, it would result in the loss of the job of at least one full-time employee. (B/0125)</p>
Housing	C/0142	D/0320		2	<p>However, accepting there will continue to be development pressures, the Community Council considers a uniformity of decision making will be in the best interests of both the Park as a whole and the community of Strathblane and Blanefield. There will have to be mechanisms to permit special needs housing development ie, sheltered housing, low cost family homes and single person units. This would be to meet the existing demand. There will be in addition, pressures for homes for the additional personnel that will inevitably be employed by the Park Authority. Many of whom will no doubt wish to live within or in close proximity to the Park. This must be addressed. (D/0320)</p>
Police	A/0205		A/0220	2	<p>Although there is no current provision in the proposals, but on the basis that we are starting with a "clean sheet of paper", I strongly suggest the need for additional police resources. This is especially relevant now in a situation where the police intend to reduce presence in rural areas. At present there are times when a single officer is covering an area from Coulport to the top of Loch Lomond. National Park designation will inevitably lead to increased numbers of visitors, further exacerbating the problem (A/0205)</p>

Comments on the consultation process					
Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Report/Leaflet positive	A/0007, A/0245 A/0280, D/0326, K/0094		A/0009, A/0039, A/0168, A/0189, K/0208, K/0273, K/0290, K/0294, N/0300, O/0348	15	<p>The Friends of Loch Lomond (FoLL) found the Consultation Document was generally clear, provided background information on the matters under review and that it highlighted the various issues to be considered in the series of questions posed in Section 3 "The National Park Proposal." (K/0094)</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to compliment SNH on the consultation document. (A/0168)</p> <p>WTS would like to congratulate SNH on the quality of the draft document produced and the considerable length to which they have gone to ensure that the consultation reaches people locally and at a national level. (K/0294)</p> <p>In particular we would like to congratulate SNH on the consultation document. It is a clear, easily read and concise document. It lays out well the process to date, what past debate has been about as well as remaining questions that need to be resolved through this consultation. In combination with the range of surgeries and meetings organised by SNH, over the proposal, it provides a good model of how the designation of such a significant site can be made more inclusive. (K/0273)</p>
Report/Leaflet negative	A/0068, A/0185, A/0139, B/0317, G/0046, H/0145	A/0213, D/0091, D/0320, B/0027, B/0136	A/0033, A/0085, A/0111, C/0334, G/0329, G/0336 H/0241	18	<p>Neither paper has a clear philosophical rationale on aims, procedures for attaining aims, or boundaries. Neither gives a summarised analysis of hitherto unsolved problems there. The current papers are an inadequate basis for public consultation. Because of this, the public consultation is bound to be largely a sham. Both papers ignore zoning, and omit experience of national parks elsewhere in the world. The papers pay no attention to previous proposals in Scotland, especially the <i>Mountain Areas of Scotland</i> (1991) report by the CCS. (A/0085)</p> <p>Annex 5 of the consultation document lists the results of the assessment exercise by area. The views expressed concerning Glen Fruin (and I use the term views rather than assessment advisedly), are subjective and extremely negative with no consideration given to some of the very positive</p>

					<p>assets which are a matter of record. (A/0213)</p> <p>The Community Council experienced difficulty in taking the assessment exercise seriously feeling that it lacked real validity. Clearly, no area within what might be termed the 'core' area of the proposed Park could fail to score highly against the criteria adopted or if perchance it did obtain a low score it must be included in the proposed park anyway because to do otherwise means a loss of territorial coherence and an administrative nightmare. Council also felt for similar reasons the opinions of communities were largely discounted in this exercise for determining the park boundary. There could be no unilateral declaration of exclusion by any community on the periphery. In our view for example, the arguments deployed in favour of the inclusion of the Argyll Forest Park seem to us to have a manufactured quality about them and to arise from the perceived inadequacies of other organisations which should be capable of providing adequate integrated management for the area. (D/0091)</p> <p>We dispute in total the benefits described in Para 3-17. There is no proof of the facts and opinions stated. We agree with the arguments put forward in Para 3-18 and 3-19. There is no proof that there will be any long-term sustainable growth and stability in the Glen by inclusion in a National Park. There is no proof of economic, social or cultural benefit to the Glen. There is no proof to the statement that other National Parks have seen an increase in tourism by acquiring National Park status. If any proof exists it is to prove to the contrary. (H/145)</p>
Process Positive	A/0023, A/0174, A/0278, A/0349, B/0262, D/0171, D/0326, H/0261, J/0198		A/0088, A/0157, A/0168, K/0208, K/0231, K/0273, K/0290, K/0294, K/0311, L/0308	19	<p>I found the meeting last Tuesday really helpful and although I seriously disagreed with some of the opinions, I thoroughly enjoyed it. It was good to see that people seem really interested enough to turn out and are not suffering from the current sickness of apathy! (A/0023)</p> <p>I write to congratulate you on the thoroughness of your reporting on the proposal that Loch Lomond and the Trossachs should be Scotland's first National Park. (A/0157)</p> <p>SNH are also to be congratulated on their very significant effort in ensuring a</p>

					<p>wide-ranging consultation which allows for all to have an involvement in developing the National Park proposals. (A/0168)</p> <p>At the outset I would wish to commend the efforts of Scottish Natural Heritage in fulfilling the role of Reporter. The whole consultation team are due full recognition and praise for their outstanding commitment to the task in hand. (H/0261)</p> <p>We recognise and commend the quality of the material that has been provided and the very real efforts that have been taken by SNH to invite comments form a broad range of views. (K/0311)</p>
Process negative	A/0068, A/0107, A/0139, A/0205, C/0187		A/0111, A/0146, A/0169, A/0182, A/0193, D/0162, F/0235, G/0329, J/0233	14	<p>It is sad that the SNH efforts to inform possible residents of the proposed Park and its adjacent areas have still not been sufficient to allow informed discussion. All the pretty printing and jargon have not led to understanding. On P. 32 there are statements which are not being fulfilled and it is apparent that the SNH is prepared to act more as a mouthpiece for the Government than of informed residents. (A/0111)</p> <p>Regarding the so-called full consultation that was supposed to take place. The first I knew of the full extent of the Park was the meeting held in the Gibson Hall on 18 January. This failure to keep the people concerned informed is simply not good enough. It is anti-democratic and goes against all the principles that National Parks are supposed to stand for. it is also patronising. There should have been more time made available for proper consultation for those outside the proposed area. (A/0182)</p> <p>At the AGM of the Loch Lomond Association in Balloch in November 2000, the reasons given by a member of the Reporting Team for excluding Strathendrick were additional population considerations and management costs. These same arguments can be used to exclude the Argyll Forest Park. The reason given for including the Argyll Forest Park was the dilution of visitor pressure. The same argument can be used as a reason to include Strathendrick. There is a clear lack of consistency here. (A/0205)</p> <p>My concern surrounds the fact that no credibility has been created for the</p>

					<p>proposal and until this is achieved, the proposal will not achieve the stated objectives. The production of professional glossy publications and holding public meetings it inclined to attract those strongly against and those strongly in favour, but does not attract the heart of the community - and those are the people in my opinion, who have created and preserved on a day to day basis the very environment which has resulted in the desire for a National Park. My reason for setting out all of the above is to illustrate the frustration and concern many people have and to illustrate why there is a lack of CREDIBILITY concerning the actions of SNH at this point in the consultation process. (C/0187)</p> <p>Over the past two months, a large number of constituents within the Garelochhead and Rosneath Peninsula area, have raised serious concerns with me on the lack of public consultation locally, on the proposed Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park. It was noted that only two public meetings (Dunoon and Arrochar) were planned to take place within Argyll and Bute. It is considered that these two public meetings would only allow a small number of individuals to contribute to the debate and wider consultation process. This was considered to be unsatisfactory. (F/0235)</p>
SNH's role	A/0098, B/0317	D/0091		3	<p>I am also concerned as to whether SNH is the right body to be consulting the public on this issue. As it is the principal architect of the Park, I feel it is wrong for it also to be the consulting body and reporter. It has made mistakes in the past and at times appears to ignore public opinion, for whatever reason. (A/098)</p> <p>This contains a statement that SNH is required to report in a balanced manner on the views of those consulted. This will not be possible as SNH has been too deeply involved in this and previous consultation exercises to be totally neutral and objective. An unbiased Reporter should have been appointed as is normal in planning procedures. (B/0317)</p>
Importance of local views	A/0102, A/0172, A/0174, A/0199, B/0262, D/0110, D/0202, D/0326, G/0046 K/0180	D/0091, B/0136 D/0056, L/0103	C/0061, C/0063, D/0162, F/0235, H/0069, H/0195, K/0231, K/0284, K/0290, K/0294,	26	<p>We contend that despite the opposition of the Thornhill and Blair Drummond Community Council, there is in fact a body of local opinion that is in favour of National Park status, and we are mindful of the opportunities that the Park proposal might present to local businesses. (B/0136)</p>

			L/0308, N/0155		<p>... if the local people are opposed to its inclusion, there is little basis for including it. (C/0063)</p> <p>Balloch & Haldane CC are of the opinion that comments regarding the extended Park boundary, especially the finer detailed boundary are better left to those Community Councils/Groups from that particular area where obvious local knowledge would be preferable to comments from a body who do not know the area. (D/0110)</p> <p>However, local opinion should be taken into consideration before any decision is made. (D/0202)</p> <p>Since we do have detailed, intimate local knowledge of our area, we hope that our comments will be given priority over any conflicting views on our area expressed by any party not local to the area. (D/0162)</p> <p>Finally, we note that the Strathfillan community have mixed views on the inclusion of the area in the proposed park. Whilst we do not hold a view one way or the other, we would like to stress the importance of obtaining clear and identifiable support for inclusion amongst the locals rather than simply relying on a perceived general desire. In that regard, the views of Strathfillan CC will be important. (G/0046)</p> <p>Where the boundary comes close to local communities we believe that it should be at the will of the community as to whether they are included within or outwith the National Park. However, the importance of being gateways to the Park, and the opportunities which this will provide, should be made clear to local populations. (L/0308)</p>
Votes for or against inclusion	D/0099, H/0145		A/0169, F/0235, J/0233	5	<p>You may have attended recently a consultation meeting on the SNH proposal for the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park. The consensus at a well attended meeting in Dunoon was that the whole of Cowal should be included within the Park perimeter. This position had been adopted two years ago by the Cowal Community Councils and endorsed recently by the Dunoon & Cowal Marketing Group. (A/0169)</p>

				<p>The Tourist Association which represents 52 businesses in the area, has voted for exclusion (majority vote 10-1). (H/0145)</p> <p>The union asked its members in the proposed area (widely defined) for their response to the simple question of whether they wished their farm to be in the Park or not. It had been hoped that responses would provide specific indication of the acceptability of the different boundary options proposed in the SNH Consultation document. However, there were few responses. Only 3 indicated that they wanted to be in the Park. Seventeen wanted to be outside. There was no pattern to the positive responses. Twelve of the 17 negative responses were in the south east quadrant of the mapped area which SNH had indicated in the main as having only a weak case for inclusion in the National Park. That count also included the Port of Menteith area which had been suggested as having a strong case for inclusion but was not in the "core" area. One view is that the low response indicates a successful attempt by SNH to persuade farmers that designation would not have any significant effect on their direct interests. (J/0233)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Comments on direct elections					
Response	W	X	Y	Total	Selected Quotations
Origins of elected/electorate	A/0020, A/0058, A/0107, C/0201, D/0351, J/0198	D/0056	A/0024, K/0294, O/0078	10	<p>People who have holiday homes and caravans in the Park area deserve a vote of some kind in the direct elections to the authority, just as residents will have, and also those with membership of major clubs with premises in the Park. They have a stake in the area and its future too, and it is a National Park not a local one. (A/0249)</p> <p>Members elected by those residing within the NP should be permanently within the NP. (D/0056)</p> <p>Those nominated by those residents within the Park for direct elections could include those who, are, or have been, local councillors or community councillors or any other eligible person resident anywhere in Scotland. (J/0198)</p>
Method of voting	A/0058, A/0143 D/0123, D/0351			4	<p>The election process should follow the spirit of Community Council elections where there is no campaigning but a simple statement from each candidate of their capabilities in representing that area. Elections should be by postal ballot and be restricted to those people on the electoral role who live in the National Park voting for the representative in their ward. (A/0123)</p> <p>I am worried if the election or appointment of members of the park authority becomes complicated and thereby expensive. (A/143)</p>
Split area into wards	D/0148, A/0174, D/0171, D/0172, D/0351, M/0282		D/0162	7	<p>It was unfortunate that in the proposal, Callander was included in the core area. This means that a population of several thousand at one edge of the Park will skew the poll in local elections. For this reason, the Community Council insists that when the electoral register is created, it should be divided into wards, otherwise urban and commercial interests will swamp those whose interests are genuinely rural. (D/0172)</p> <p>The directly elected representatives should a bigger proportion of the Board and should come from wards equally representing land masses and not constituency numbers. Voting should be first past the post and NEVER political. (M/0282)</p>

Timing of elections	A/0185, A/0133, A/0199, J/0198			4	<p>After the first election and the establishment of rotation, there should only be one or two seats a year to vote for. I'd like to see the term of office set at 6 or 7 years, to emphasise its importance, differentiate it from any kinship to LA elections, and encourage longterm outlooks and experience. NPA members should not be allowed to arrange substitute cronies to fill their seats sometimes; this undermines the personal responsibility, and applies as much to national quango nominees as to elected reps. I have been 'going on' for some time about the help that could come from the Electoral Reform Society and I hope by now that folk in Edinburgh have been in touch to discuss details. The ERS has a high reputation for probity, and will adapt it's method to circumstances. I hope the following summary may be generally applicable. First, an electoral register is formed of every voter resident in the Park, by the 3 LA staffs. This may require display for scrutiny and corrections, as usual. Then each voter (A/0185)</p> <p>The first direct elections could be held between February and March 2002 and thereafter they should be held every four or five years. (A/0199)</p>
---------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	---	--