

## Annex 1 Cairngorm and Glenmore Consultation Response

### Process

The public consultation ran for 14 weeks from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015 to 9<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

The consultation was hosted on CNPA website and comprised the draft strategy for the area, and three management plans for; Glenmore (Forest Enterprise Scotland), Cairngorm Estate (Highlands and Islands Enterprise) and CairnGorm Mountain (Natural Retreats). Respondents were prompted by a series of set questions.

In advance of the start, community councils, local interest groups and local and national stakeholders were made aware of the consultation and encouraged to respond via the website.

During the consultation the Cairngorms Business Partnership organised a business breakfast to discuss the consultation. A report by CBP is in Annex 4. The partners organised a public drop-in session in Aviemore.

### Responses

Some 50 individuals attended the public drop-in in Aviemore 'posting' a wide range of comments on summary documents of the strategy and three management plans.

Forty three individual responses were received mainly via the website but a few were emailed direct to CNPA.

In addition to the individual responses 17 agencies/non-governmental organisations responded. Some used the on-line facility but many chose to submit an individual written response. Some followed the structure of the questions while others used their own format.

### Summary of Responses

We have analysed the responses using the three categories described above:-

1. Response at public drop-in
2. Individual Responses
3. Agency/NGO Responses

In preparing these summaries we have attempted to group common ideas together without diluting or altering the meaning of the responses. Inevitably any summary and amalgamation will lose some of the detail but the intent is to give clarity to common issues and a sense of how many respondents shared support or concerns for these issues.

Responses made at the public drop-in are grouped according to topic while the other two categories follow the consultation format. We have indicated the number of individuals or agencies that made a common response.

Finally, we have added a 'partners' response' to the consultation responses detailing how we intend to act on each comment. The summaries are contained in Annex's 1 to 3.

## Key Issues

We have identified the following key issues that need to be addressed in the final strategy and management plans:-

1. The case for developing the strategy needs to be clearer particularly the assumptions about increased visitor numbers, as well as the reasons for focusing on Cairngorm and Glenmore and how it fits with wider plans in the National Park.
2. The importance of both the natural and cultural heritage of the area needs to be clearer as do the plans to conserve and enhance these qualities. There is consensus that the outstanding natural landscape of the area -'on the edge of wildness'- must be maintained.
3. There needs to be greater clarity on how additional visitors are to be provided for while still conserving and enhancing the natural heritage.
4. There needs to be stronger case for upgrading existing facilities (particularly buildings) and a clear case made for the preferred location of these facilities. The relevance of the existing 'settlement boundary' in Glenmore needs to be made clearer – at present some see it as encouraging over development.
5. A stronger commitment to making the area more accessible to a wider range of visitors of all abilities needs to be made.
6. There is consensus that there are opportunities for more consistent provision of visitor information and strong support for more 'face to face' contact – enhanced and better coordinated ranger provision. However, at present it is unclear what should be the focus of the visitor experience – what would we like to encourage visitors to the area to think and feel?
7. There is support for better coordination of information, leafleting and signage reduction and improvement.
8. The opportunities for outdoor learning are recognised but there needs to be greater detail on how it is envisaged that this work is taken forward. Opportunities for volunteering need to be more clearly presented.

9. There is strong consensus for making significant improvements to public transport to the area, its connections with surrounding communities and rationalising the provision for private car parking.

### **Next Steps**

Partners are meeting with residents, local business and stakeholders in May and June to discuss the consultation responses. A revised strategy will then be prepared for approval by all partners in September.

**ANNEX 1 Cairngorm and Glenmore Summary of Consultation Responses from Aviemore Public Drop-in**

Some 50 people attended

‘Look and Feel’ of the Area	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Don't change too much, any developments to be in keeping and scale retaining individuality.	3	If new facilities are developed we want them to be high quality in design and efficiency and reflect the area.
Create an entrance to the Park and develop more co-ordinated and effective signage	3	We agree and this will form part of the strategy
Gaelic/English signs help visitors understand meaning of place names particularly mountains	2	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.
Resist demands for bi-lingual signs – if any Gaelic is necessary English should come first	1	We disagree and will look at the case for using Gaelic to improve visitors understanding and appreciation of the area.
More trees please	1	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and the detail will be contained in in the FCS Forest Management Plan and HIE Cairngorm Estate Management Plan
Good to remove some trees and open up views	1	We agree and the removal of individual trees or clumps of trees to improve views will form part of the strategy and action plans
Resist development on the mountain access road - this will spoil the view from the mountain as Aviemore already looks like an urban sprawl.	1	We agree
Do something about roadside verges along loch side. At present it gives visitors a bad impression	1	We agree and this will form part of Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan.

Facilities	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Forest Visitor Centre should move to a new location – beach	2	We disagree. We feel that the clearing that currently houses the visitor centre and SYHA building offers the best opportunity for new or upgraded facilities without negatively impacting on the landscape, designated sites or community space in Glenmore.
Upgrade or replace SYHA building	2	<b>SYHA and Highlife Highland are currently looking in more detail at the options for improved outdoor learning facilities. That work is due summer 2016</b>
Improve public toilets – location, opening hours, numbers	4	We consider there are sufficient toilets in area but these require better signage and promotion. We will look at the provision as we refine the action plans.
Improve facilities for children	2	We will consider this as part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan.
Focus on outdoor experience with covered shelter for groups	2	We will consider this as part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan.
Improve design and function of litter bins	2	We will consider this as part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan.
Support for Natural Retreats developing skiing, dry skiing, mt biking	3	<b>New developments will be subject to planning consent and need to meet polices in the Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan.</b>
Concern about overdevelopment by Natural Retreats – conference centre, log cabins.	2	<b>New developments will be subject to planning consent and need to meet polices in the Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan. The area is not zoned for accommodation.</b>
Improve broadband	1	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Keep all information facilities small with longer opening hours	2	<b>If new facilities are developed we want them to be high quality in design and efficiency and reflect the area. We will consider longer opening hours as part of the</b>

		development of the action plans.
Make sled dog area	1	We disagree – this opportunity has only been raised once and we do not consider it a priority.
Dedicated BBQ area	1	These already exist but we will look at the quantity, their location and how they are promoted as part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan.
Bus shelter and pavements that you can use	1	We agree and this will be part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan
In any Natural Retreats developments there must be a place for the many small operators	1	We will pass this information on to Natural Retreats.

<b>Information and Visitor Management</b>	<b>No of Respondents</b>	<b>Partners Response</b>
Improve the ranger service – more, longer hours	5	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.
Improve litter collection	2	We agree that further work is required on promoting responsible behaviour
Improve visitor information – in Aviemore and leaflets	2	We agree and this will form part of the strategy

Outdoor Access	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Improve the path network including maintenance, links and circular routes	6	We agree and this will form part of the strategy
High priority for conservation, no new paths in sensitive areas – can some dead end forest tracks be closed off?	1	We agree and will focus promotion of the signed path network rather than ‘dead ends’.
Retain the closed system on CairnGorm	2	There are no proposals to ‘open the closed system’. The ‘closed system’ is a Section 50 Agreement as part of the planning consent for the funicular railway and is an agreement between the operator and Highland Council and Scottish Natural Heritage. This is open to review and has been modified on several occasions to allow guided excursions and access to the top station. Any changes need to demonstrate that they do not damage the protected sites next to the ski area
Ban wild camping and restrict overnight campervans (1)	4	We recognise that some of the behaviours associated with some wild camping (littering, toileting, fires in the native woodland) are irresponsible. Promoting responsible access will be a key part of the final strategy.
Segregate cyclists and walkers for safety	1	We consider that the creation of wider multi-use paths linking car parks and facilities will solve this problem. Evidence across Europe clearly indicates that well designed paths can be safely and enjoyably shared by a range of users.
Improved signage for cyclists to encourage use of Logging Trail	1	We agree and this will form part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan

Transport and parking	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Improve public transport links from Aviemore	4	We agree and this will form part of the strategy
Improve car parking and car park signage	6	We agree and this will form part of the strategy
No new large car parks	2	We agree. There are no plans to increase the number of parking places but we may look at moving some car parks at the visitor centre.
Remove car parking charges or develop concessionary scheme for residents	6	We agree that the issue of charging for car parking needs to be re-considered along with how it applies to residents.
Prevent roadside parking	3	We agree and this will form part of the strategy and action plans

Consultation Process	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Where does this fit in the National Park Plan?	1	The development of a strategy for Cairngorm and Glenmore is a key action in the current National Park Partnership Plan
Strategy is too business orientated	1	We disagree but do recognise that the final documents need to give more emphasis to the protection and enhancement of nature and the needs of residents.
Engage more with local residents	1	We consider that this work has involved residents. Prior to the consultation we held two drop-in sessions at Glenmore and we have regularly met with local businesses and Aviemore Community Council.



**ANNEX 2 Cairngorm and Glenmore Summary of Consultation Responses from Individuals**

Amalgamation of comments – responses with one comment have been omitted

43 respondents but some responses were partial

**Cairngorm and Glenmore Strategy**

**Question 1: Set in the wider context, what in your view is the distinctive character and role of Cairngorm and Glenmore? How can it best contribute to the wider area?**

Character and role	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Major outdoor attraction & centre for wide range of outdoor activities and experiences : a gateway to the mountains	21	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Nationally important natural and cultural environment (wildness, woodlands, mountains and wildlife) requiring protection and enhancement.	21	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Place for education and information	5	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Exemplar of good practice in visitor management and innovation/ nature & business thriving	4	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Important to the local economy	4	We agree and this will be clearly stated in the final strategy
Take pressure off other areas	4	We recognise that this is already the case but the reason for improving the area is twofold:- 1. The existing facilities are dated and were not developed in a coordinated way so there is considerable scope for improvement 2. We anticipate that improvements at CairnGorm Mountain, improved transportation links (A9) and

		general visitor trends will see an increase in people wanting to visit the area.
Needs new modern facilities and better sense of arrival	3	We agree and this will form part of the strategy
Unique place to celebrate Gaelic	2	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.

**Question 2: What do you currently like about Cairngorm and Glenmore that you want to see retained? What would you like to change or improve?**

Like	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Beautiful , wild, natural environment with space for people and nature	7	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Wide range of outdoor activities	5	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Good facilities: FCS, SYHA, Glenmore Lodge	4	We agree that some facilities are very good, others like the SYHA building require modernisation
Good estate management with good range of paths/ easy access	6	We are pleased that respondents recognise good practice in the area.
Lack of development inc street lighting	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Improvements:		
Increased ranger presence and better visitor management to encourage responsible behaviour	10	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.
Better car parking with a consistent approach to charging (or no charging)	7	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Better paths (including) cycling with better signage and promotion	6	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and

		action plans
Forest restoration/expansion	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and the detail will be contained in in the FCS Forest Management Plan and HIE Cairngorm Estate Management Plan
Improved public transport	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
More group accommodation needed	2	We will consider this in further developing the Glenmore Visitor Improvement plan and specifically options to improve the SYHA building.
Better traffic control/bridge over road	2	We agree that better pedestrian access is required through Glenmore but do not consider that a bridge is the best solution because of the number of different places that people want to cross the road.
Better information; cultural heritage, Gaelic & wildlife	3	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.
Better toilets	2	We consider that are sufficient toilets in area but these require better signage a promotion. We will look at the provision as we refine the action plans.
Open the 'Closed System'	2	The 'closed system' is a Section 50 Agreement as part of the planning consent for the funicular railway and is an agreement between the operator and Highland Council and Scottish Natural Heritage. This is open to review and has been modified on several occasions to allow guided excursions and access to the top station. Any changes need to demonstrate that they do not damage the protected sites next to the ski area
Interpretation of cultural heritage and Gaelic	2	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.
New iconic in-keeping facilities	2	If new facilities are developed we want them to be high quality in design and efficiency and reflect the area. We want them to be 'outstanding' rather than 'stand out'.

Build new facilities at different locations (beech, in woodland)	2	We disagree. We feel that the clearing that currently houses the visitor centre and SYHA building offers the best opportunity for new or upgraded facilities without negatively impacting on the landscape, designated sites or community space. In Glenmore.
--	---	---

**Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed vision, aim and objectives? If not, what would you change?**

	No of Respondents	Partners Response
<b>Agree</b>	15	
<b>Disagree</b>	17	
<b>Changes</b>		
Plans need to be more specific and easier to understand	4	We agree and will strive to make the final strategy and action plans easier to understand.
Reduce development/ focus on better quality facilities not new	3	We partially agree. Where we consider improvements we will look at upgrades and refurbishment along with options for new build because some facilities may be so outdated and downgraded that replacement is more efficient.
Reduce numbers, visitor impact, improve conservation	3	We do not agree that numbers to the area need reduced and we have not included any proposals to reduce

		numbers. We consider that numbers are likely to increase through better promotion of the National Park and CairnGorm Mountain and that we need to better manage the impact of visitors: the very reason for the strategy and action plans.
Strategy should spread visitors to wider strath, develop wider area	2	We partially agree. The strategy was developed because it was recognised in the National Park Partnership Plan that there was nowhere else in the National Park that was both so important for nature and so highly visited and therefore in need of a specific strategy and action plans. We still consider this to be the case. We agree that visitor information provided in the area has a key role to play in promoting experiences throughout the National Park and further afield. The Sustainable Tourism Strategy and Action Plan covers the whole National Park.
Better connectivity with Aviemore/public transport	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Open closed system/ look at closed system	2	The 'closed system' is a Section 50 Agreement as part of the planning consent for the funicular railway and is an agreement between the operator and Highland Council and Scottish Natural Heritage. This is open to review and has been modified on several occasions to allow guided excursions and access to the top station. Any changes need to demonstrate that they do not damage the protected sites next to the ski area
Greater emphasis on cultural heritage and Gaelic	2	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.

**Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed approach and suggested headline areas of work identified? If not, what would you add or change?**

	No of Respondents	Partners Response
<b>Agree</b>	20	
<b>Disagree</b>	8	
<b>Partly</b>	39	
<b>Changes:</b>		
Plans need to be more specific and easier to understand	5	We agree and will strive to make the final strategy and action plans easier to understand.
Better car parking with a consistent approach to charging (or no charging)	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Improve transport and through links	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Increase ranger presence, reduce litter and dog waste	3	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.
Improve cultural heritage interpretation / improve interpretation	2	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.
Better integration of and support from local providers	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans

## Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan

**Question 5: Are there other specific issues relating to Glenmore that you think this plan should address?**

Comment	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Better coordinated parking and traffic management	9	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Easier access from Glenmore to hill paths	3	We agree and this will form part of the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan
Safer routes through Glenmore	4	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Improve dated facilities (SYHA, Watersports, VC, Campsite)	6	We agree and will consider options as we refine the Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan
Better public toilets	3	We consider that are sufficient toilets in area but these require better signage a promotion. We will look at the provision as we refine the action plans.
Better waste recycling / litter removal	2	We agree and this will form part of the final action plans
Less signage/ better signage	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Increase use of Gaelic language	2	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.
Reduce wear and tear on natural environment / tidy area	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Improve broadband	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans

**Question 6: Do you support the proposals? If not, what other proposals would help deliver the enhancements sought?**

	No of Respondents	Partners Response
<b>Yes</b>	13	
<b>No</b>	7	
<b>Other proposals</b>		
Plans need to be more specific and easier to understand	2	We agree and will strive to make the final strategy and action plans easier to understand.
Retain natural environment and do not encourage visitors into wilder areas	2	We agree with retaining the natural environment. Visitor information will encourage people to use the promoted path network.
Improve signage, Gaelic signage and information	3	We agree that the draft did not make the most of the opportunities to celebrate the cultural heritage of the area and we will make changes to the final strategy.

**Question 7: Any Additional Comments**

Comment	No of Respondents	Partners Response
Improve and promote better public transport	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Improve year round activities/ dry ski slope	2	Natural Retreats is currently developing plans to improve the year round activities at CairnGorm Mountain.



## ANNEX 3 Cairngorm and Glenmore Summary of Consultation Responses from representative bodies

### Cairngorm and Glenmore Strategy

RSPB	MCofS	Paths for All Partnership
Ramblers Scotland	Cairngorms Business Partnership	John Muir Trust
Glenmore Lodge	North East Mountain Trust	Cairngorms Campaign
BASI	B&S Community Transport	Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group
Inclusive Cairngorms	Rothiemurchus Estate	Scottish Campaign for National Parks
SEPA	Reindeer Centre	

### Pre-amble

Comment	No of Consultees	Partners Response
Supportive of general direction of strategy and see need for work	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Strategy should emphasis more the international importance of the area for nature conservation and the need to conserve and enhance this asset	6	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Strategy development should have had greater local involvement	3	We held two public drop-in sessions in Glenmore when developing the strategy prior to public consultation as well as regular meetings with the Community Council and local businesses. As part of this consultation we also held a well-attended public drop-in Aviemore.
Strategy fails to consider the opportunity of bringing the visitor experience 'down the hill' to Glenmore or address impacts of greater	2	We considered this and disagree that it is currently a viable option. There is no space in Glenmore for the scale of car parking

<p>visitor numbers to CairnGorm Mt</p>		<p>that would be required to replicate that on CairnGorm Mountain and currently the public transport is not sufficient. Natural Retreats has a 23 year lease to manage CairnGorm Mountain and we understand that the business plan is based on year round visitors of at least the same numbers as in previous years (c 250,000 funicular users). We agree that it would be better to encourage greater use of public transport to access the area and this forms part of the strategy.</p>
<p>Strategy quite vague/lacks detail</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>We agree that the strategy lacks detail. It is intended to clearly state the main improvements across the area rather than the detail. The action plans should provide the detail and we agree that these are variable in content and need to be improved.</p>
<p>Concern that it does not have support of significant partners – Rothiemurchus and Glenmore Lodge – and involves large sums of public funds</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The strategy was developed for the public land holding by the public sector partners. It has the support of Sportscotland at Glenmore Lodge. Rothiemurchus Estate has been involved in the consultations from the inception of the work. No public funds have been designated to take this project beyond the development of the strategy and action plans.</p>

**Question 1: Set in the wider context, what in your view is the distinctive character and role of Cairngorm and Glenmore? How can it best contribute to the wider area?**

Character and role	No of Consultees	Partners Response
Almost unique among Scottish landscapes – diverse ecology and outstanding and varied landscapes of forest, loch and Cairngorm plateau and the fact that it is largely unspoilt is remarkable: high quality environment good air, water and soil	5	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Gateway to the mountains and a destination in its own right/ journey through native forest to mountains – ‘iconic destination’ within CNP’, ‘honeypot’/visitor hub	7	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Strategy fails to emphasise the international importance for wildlife/conservation ( and 3 SACs and 6 SPA’s as the distinctive character of the area)	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Missed opportunity to include Rothiemurchus, and take this work wider across CNP and look at distributing visitors more widely	4	<p>The strategy was developed because it was recognised in the National Park Partnership Plan that there was nowhere else in the National Park that was both so important for nature and so highly visited and therefore in need of a specific strategy and action plans. The Sustainable Tourism Strategy and Action Plan covers the whole National Park.</p> <p>We agree that visitor information provided in the area has a key role to play in promoting experiences throughout the National Park and further afield.</p> <p>Rothiemurchus Estate has been involved in the consultations from the inception of the work.</p>

Strategy needs to make more of the bigger landscape scale vision - question whether it is possible to increase visitor numbers and enhance the environment inc wild land	3	We agree that the landscape scale vision needs to be clear in the final strategy. Better promotion of the National Park and CairnGorm Mountain, and improved transportation links (A9) lead us to conclude that visitors to the area are likely to increase by 15% in the last decade. The challenge is to manage this potential increase and enhance the environment.
Opportunity to be an exemplar of collaborative visitor management, outdoor sport and recreation alongside conservation.	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Final proposals must not have a negative impact and maintain and enhancing the areas distinctiveness	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Strategy should use 'national partners' more in the development phase and ongoing work	3	We agree.

**Question 2: What do you currently like about Cairngorm and Glenmore that you want to see retained? What would you like to change or improve?**

Like	No of Consultees	Partners Response
Gateway to high quality wild land – lochs, native forest and mountains with associated wildlife.	6	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Improvements:		
Concerns that the work is creating a honey pot and should consider spreading visitors wider	3	We recognise that this is already the case but the reason for improving the area is twofold:- 3. The existing facilities are dated and were not developed in a coordinated way so there is considerable scope for improvement

		4. We anticipate that improvements at Cairngorm Mountain, improved transportation links (A9) and general visitor trends will see an increase in people wanting to visit the area.
Care that the unspoilt beauty is retained with positive improvements to nature management	2	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Future developments should be discrete or there should be a commitment to no new developments should be stronger – upgrade and replace buildings not new	3	Where we consider improvements we will look at upgrades and refurbishment along with options for new build because some facilities may be so outdated and downgraded that replacement is more efficient. If new facilities are developed we want them to be high quality in design and efficiency and reflect the area. We want them to be ‘outstanding’ rather than ‘stand out’
Concerns about creeping urbanisation particularly at Badaguish	3	We agree that further discussions with Badaguisih are required.
Concerns that use of planning term ‘settlement boundary’ at Glenmore is inviting development..esp close to Loch Morlich Shore	3	We appreciate that we have not made the case for the settlement boundary and this has raised unnecessary concerns. The boundary defines the area within which any development can take place and the Local Development Plan further defines what types of development are acceptable; both need to be considered together. There is very little scope for any development in Glenmore and it is restricted to the existing sites. There is no intention to develop houses. There is outline consent for up to 20 cabins on the campsite and partners are looking at options to upgrade the Youth Hostel and visitor centre.
Support Park wide (area wide) approach to branding, waymarking	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Affordable campsite/ reduction in wild camping	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Support improved public transport , looking at whole strath.	4	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Improved path network for all	4	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans
Consolidation and better linking of car parking ( and if charging is used it should be part of a consistent approach to improved public transport)	5	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy and action plans

Invest in a professional (7 day) ranger service – potentially funded from franchised visitor facilities – unitary visitor management service	3	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.
--	---	---

**Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed vision, aim and objectives? If not, what would you change?**

	No of Consultees	Partners Response
<b>Support/ Qualified support</b>	12	
<b>Disagree</b>		
<b>Changes</b>		
Vision should be an international exemplar of inviting, engaging visitor experience and should link to clear realistic actions	2	We agree
Greater emphasis on equality of access	3	We agree. The final documents need to have a stronger commitment to making the area and the facilities more accessible to all.
More empirical evidence and data, and data on visitor numbers, required before finalising the strategy...how many is too many visitors?	3	We disagree. We feel that this area has been studied extensively since the Cairngorms Recreation Survey 1997-98 through to the CRAGG Visitor, Visitor Infrastructure and Tourism Audit 2013.

		Current trends indicate that the area is likely to attract an extra 150,000 visits per year by 2026 (15% increase). The strategy is intended to plan for this increase.
Concerns that it puts economic and social concerns above environmental	2	We disagree and commit to strengthen the environmental commitment in the strategy.
Final proposals must not have a negative impact on Wild Land , protected species on all habitats, or the features that attract people	2	We agree
Should explicitly state aim of improving public transport, reducing motorists and increasing cyclists and walkers	4	We agree
Strategy should link out to/focus on other areas of CNP/be set in context of whole CNP	4	The National Park Partnership Plan identifies Cairngorm and Glenmore as an area requiring a specific strategy because it is both the most visited area and the most highly designated. No other area in the National Park has been identified as requiring this detailed approach. The Sustainable Tourism Strategy and Action Plan covers the whole Park.
Needs of local people should be given more prominence in the strategy (too much emphasis on day visitor)	2	We understand this concern and feel that it may a lack of clarity on our part. Throughout we use the term 'visitor' to mean someone who is visiting an area and undertaking a recreational activity. We understand that many of the visitors reside in Badenoch and Strathspey and the strategy is designed to cater for their needs as much as visitors from further afield.

**Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed approach and suggested headline areas of work identified? If not, what would you add or change?**

	No of Consultees	Partners Response
<b>Support/Qualified support</b>	6	
<b>Disagree</b>		
<b>Did not answer</b>		
<b>Changes:</b>		
Language in strategy needs to be clearer & SMARTER with monitoring and evaluation framework/needs more detail more detail on predicted visitor numbers, capacity & impact	7	We agree that the strategy needs to be clearer. We agree that action plans need to be smarter. Current trends indicate that the area is likely to attract an extra 150,000 visits per year by 2026 (15% increase). The strategy is intended to plan for this increase. We will coordinate and refine the monitoring of the current capacity indicators and develop new indicators where there are gaps.
Strategy needs better linkages to existing plans – Forest Management Plans, Active Cairngorms, CRAGG MP	3	We agree
Strategy needs to take account of a much more detailed situation analysis looking at the environment, current use and future demands and visitor trends	2	We disagree. We feel that this area has been studied extensively since the Cairngorms Recreation Survey 1997-98 through to the CRAGG Visitor, Visitor Infrastructure and Tourism Audit 2013. Current trends indicate that regardless of the strategy that the area will be getting an extra 150,000 visits per year by 2026 (15% increase). The strategy is intended to plan for this increase and not encourage it. If we have missed data we would be happy to



		reassess this situation.
Support increase in montane woodland	2	We agree
Greater emphasis on designated sites and habitat management including deer, reindeer and the impacts of access	2	We agree that the strategy should be clear about the protection and enhancement of designated sites but the detail of this work is already covered in existing site management plans
Support more opportunities for outdoor environmental learning for all promoting environmental sensitivity & climate change	5	We agree
Outdoor Learning proposals require greater clarity/further development/not needed (1)	3	SYHA and Highlife Highland are currently looking in more detail at the options for improved outdoor learning facilities. That work is due summer 2016.
Further detail on rationalising car parking required & more emphasis on everyday walking, cycling and active travel.	2	We agree and this will be covered in the updated action plans.

## Glenmore Visitor Improvement Plan

**Question 5: Are there other specific issues relating to Glenmore that you think this plan should address?**

Comment	No of Consultees	Partners Response
Greater emphasis on equality of access inc affordability	3	We agree. The final documents need to have a stronger commitment to making the area and the facilities more accessible to all.
Support improved paths through Glenmore to make it more pedestrian friendly	2	We agree
Consolidation of Glenmore village creating a better sense of place & improved signage in low ground	2	We agree
Opportunity for Glenmore to be an exemplar of responsible behaviour (how will it address this)	2	We agree
Accessible, frequent and environmentally friendly transport needs addressed (inc bike bus)	3	We agree
Images of overflowing bins are not irresponsible behaviour but poor waste management	3	We agree and recognise that this was a slightly 'lazy' way of trying to visually demonstrate irresponsible behaviour. We maintain that there is reliable anecdotal of irresponsible behaviour increasing and that there is a need to reduce this trend.
Support increased ranger presence	3	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.
Opportunities for affordable informal camping should be created	2	We agree
Support improving path network and realigning some for nature conservation	4	We agree

**Question 6: Do you support the proposals? If not, what other proposals would help deliver the enhancements sought?**

	No of Consultees	Partners Response
<b>Supportive/Qualified support</b>	4	
<b>No</b>	1	
<b>Other proposals</b>		
Proposals need to be more evidence based with further work on HRA required	2	We disagree. We feel that this area has been studied extensively since the Cairngorms Recreation Survey 1997-98 through to the CRAGG Visitor, Visitor Infrastructure and Tourism Audit 2013.
Landscape enhancement proposals require more detail with overfelling to improve views will have negative impact on natural heritage	2	We disagree. Large scale felling is covered in the existing long term Forest Management Plan. Small scale felling mentioned in these plans amounts to a few trees to open up views.
Details on how outdoor learning is delivered should be included with further clarity on partnership between SYHA and Highlife Highland required including potential for displacement	6	SYHA and Highlife Highland are currently looking in more detail at the options for improved outdoor learning facilities. That work is due summer 2016.
Upgrade existing facilities rather than new build – any new build should be to highest environmental standard	2	Where we consider improvements we will look at upgrades and refurbishment along with options for new build because some facilities may be so outdated and downgraded that replacement is more efficient. If new facilities are developed we want them to be high quality in design and efficiency and reflect the area. We want them to be ‘outstanding’ rather than ‘stand out’
Improved ranger presence required	2	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.

**Question 7: Any Additional Comments**

Comment	Consultee	Partners Response
Strategy should indicate how it is helping to deliver the National Walking and Cycling Strategies, and Aviemore Active Travel Plan	2	We agree that the strategy should link to national and regional strategies
Current documents do not have enough detail (and final documents should have an EIA including visual assessments of impact from wild land area)	2	We agree that some of the action plans lack details and we will work improve this. We do not agree that the strategy requires and EIA.
Increased ranger provision should be considered alongside capital investment	3	We agree that a more effective and coordinated ranger presence is required and this will form part of the final strategy.
Quality integrated environmentally friendly travel transport across the B&S area is vital – accessible to all	3	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
Improve car parking and rethink parking charges, consider residents use	4	We agree and this will form part of the final strategy
<b>Cairngorm Estate</b>		
Opportunity to integrate management across the area by FCS taking on the role from HIE	1	We will consider this option.
Well written and considered – comfortable supporting	1	
Excellent location for influencing visitor behaviour on plateau	1	We agree
Context should include wider montane area	1	Partially agree: if the strategy and action plans encourage responsible visitor behaviour within the public ownership then the impact on the wider montane area will be positive.
Past development and lack of transparency indicates that this needs rigorous scrutiny	1	
No mention of habitat management, environment of disturbance and trampling , Reindeer , or deer culling	2	We agree that the strategy should be clear about the protection and enhancement of designated sites but the detail of this work is already covered in existing site management plans
<b>Cairngorm Mountain</b>		
Lacks detail and clarity and as such raises concerns about what is intended – inc mountain biking, dry ski slope	3	We agree and will ask Natural Retreats to provide more detail

Encouraging larger visitor numbers is likely to have implications for visitor safety and nature conservation	2	We disagree. We are not aware that visitors to CairnGorm are causing more damage to the environment. We are not aware of any increase in mountain accidents or incidents following the development of the funicular.
Support retaining the 'closed system'	4	There are no proposals to 'open the closed system'. The 'closed system' is a Section 50 Agreement as part of the planning consent for the funicular railway and is an agreement between the operator and Highland Council and Scottish Natural Heritage. This is open to review and has been modified on several occasions to allow guided excursions and access to the top station. Any changes need to demonstrate that they do not damage the protected sites next to the ski area
Inappropriate site for, accommodation, conference facilities , 'all weather' facilities – locate in Strath	2	New developments will be subject to planning consent and need to meet polices in the Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan.
Not mentioned in annex – but proposed new building should be in keeping with mountain and reduce visual impact and should safeguard the wild land character (SPP2	2	We agree and any plans for new buildings will be subject to planning consent and need to meet the polices in the Cairngorms National park Local Development Plan.
Concern about the negative environmental impacts of increased commercialisation inc extending ski uplift at CairnGorm Mountain	3	New developments will be subject to planning consent and need to meet polices in the Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan.

## **ANNEX 4 Cairngorms Business Partnership - Business Breakfast Notes**

### **Cairngorm and Glenmore Consultation 04.02.16 08:30 -10:30**

#### **Overall strategy - Hamish Trench**

- Enhancing the quality of experience, rather than big development and fundamental change
- Keep distinct sense of place and what draws people here in the first place
- Set out long term direction, to guide future development plans and seek investment needed to keep this special place and great visitor experience
- Part of process is to build the case for investment in the area
- Improve visitor experience and connectivity (transport links)
- Improve year round offering
- Clear and consistent promotion

#### **Specific proposals - Graeme Prest**

- Look at Glenmore in context, Aviemore, through Glenmore to the Mountain, the long term view
- What is the role of Glenmore? Visitor experience and the wider management of the forest, nature conservation and habitat restoration
- Visitor Centre is 30 years old, there has never been a longer term view and joined up approach beyond Glenmore

#### **Post consultation**

- Next stage is practical feasibility on the ground after consultation process closes in March
- Key outcome will be a concept spatial plan, in partnership with key players in Glenmore
- Value already seen in what a collaborative approach can bring
- With CNPA take forward to develop a brief
- More feasibility work
- Then funding to bring plans to reality

Work to open up some of the views, look at the landscape as well as physical infrastructure

Provide a sense of arrival

Outline proposals

- 70,000 people per year use the Logging Way
- SYHA are reviewing their offering at Cairngorm Lodge
- Highlife Highland looking to improve outdoor learning in the area
- Perhaps shared facility SYHA & Forestry Commission with one welcome point
- Need an integrated network of cycling and walking trails, less signs and reduction in disturbance to important wildlife
- Parking – traffic management needs a lot of work in partnership

- Car park charging – more coordinated approach required

#### Q&A

David Fraser – Rather than direct funding to develop Glenmore, could the investment be used to seed investment in the wider area as private investment will follow initial public funding

Hamish Trench – agreed in principle, current focus is on enhancing Cairngorm & Glenmore as well as other areas in the Park but with an aim to make C&G compete with any National Park in the world, not just home grown visitors. There has been more than £10MM investment in last 10 years. If we don't invest in C&G the wider Strath will suffer over the coming years, C&G is the key driver. Currently there is no funding in place

---

Philippa Grant – what about the future, C&G is already the most visited area in the CNP, what can visitors expect in 5-10-15 years' time? Worldwide National Park brand is recognised as a brand of excellence

HT – Visitor expects quality of experience to match infrastructure. Doesn't currently exist in the standard we should expect, visitors are looking for authentic sustainable experiences

---

Janet Harris – Observations from Creative Cairngorms

- Visitors who were here as a child are now bringing their children
  - Large number of international customers
  - Although there is a TIC in Aviemore visitors ask in shop what can we do, best hotels, best experiences, especially in the evening
- 

DF – what are people looking for? A joined up approach, infrastructure is vital

---

Tilly Smith – There is no ranger provision within the current plan, Glenmore needs an active ranger service and out of hours rangers.

Pete Crane – CNPA recently reviewed ranger provision and would like to improve the capacity to deliver increased ranger service and are looking to increase volunteer rangers; enthusiastic ambassadors for the area

---

Mike Dearman – No provision for those coming for a specific reason, ie, skiing, sled-dogs, cycling – how will facilities be better for them? Assumption is people are going to Glenmore and don't know what to do so consider these groups.

HT - Is strategy to get more people to stop in Glenmore? Anticipate more people will come to the area in years to come and infrastructure needs to be in place to handle the volume. How do we encourage people to stay in the area, extend their stay and connect up attractions?

Car park charges – enable people to get out and enjoy don't charge them

Graeme Prest - This will be looked at from Aviemore to Cairngorm Mountain, better public transport will make the whole thing work better. Forestry charging for parking was a national decision, not Glenmore specific.

Not planning to build more car parks, rather consolidate and support what is there

---

---

Gail Conn – visitors are coming for a unique, wild, beautiful experience, families for activities, don't want to see the Park looking like other Parks. Keep the uniqueness

---

---

Amanda Frazer – public transport provision essential

---

---

Erin McBean – Need to prepare the visitor for what they are coming to, improved knowledge of what is here before arrival

---

---

Barry Edmondson - how do we make sure the effort on Glenmore doesn't have negative impact on other businesses in Park, why not develop further afield?

HT – future of area discussion has to include SYHA rather than let them plough on independently. Improving the quality of C&G should benefit businesses out with. Creating a network of businesses in area can provide a joined up approach and offering to visitors

PC – Highland Wildlife Park and Landmark Park are investing independently, also investment in Laggan and Kincaig recently

---

---

Tim Hall – Need a better road up to the Cas car park, public transport and access to the hills. Cairngorm Estate Management Plan – to encourage external businesses to use the estate for responsible access



Jim Cornfoot – The area is owned by HIE who want to encourage local outdoor recreation businesses and guided services to use car parks, local ski businesses and ski schools also benefit

Natural Retreats agree transport infrastructure is vital

Logging way stops at Glenmore, certain sections have to go on the road, getting people off the road would be ideal

---

JH – Stargazing, diversification for the future

Vicky Hilton - Glenlivet is the first designated dark sky site in the Park

---

Sara Paul – Noted there is no real reference to increasing the usage of the area by disabled people. Item 1.4 of the Glenmore Visitor Survey makes mention of meeting legislation, but it would be advantageous to look beyond the requirements of legislation. The Cairngorms Visitor Survey 2014-15 revealed that only 7% of visitors said they had a disability, compared to 20% of the Scottish population. Recognise where people are and how to make it easy for them

GP/HT happy to meet with Sara, should be part of how infrastructure is developed

---

Phil Rogers –Clearing trees for better views/trees currently hide tents

There should be provision for car parks just off the road amongst the trees in landscaped areas/ people then think they are driving through a wilderness area

GP – landscaping, nature conservation and more wooded areas have been a success, with natural generation back up the Mountain

Opening up views will be subtle not wiping out areas of cover

Hiding cars in the woods – scale different, also Glenmore is a nature conservation area so adding more parking in an area so important for nature is an issue

Car park spaces currently at Glenmore? Not known

---

MD - Should the VIC be at the Hayfield?

GP - Options for what can be done at Glenmore are restricted

PG - Can the Hayfield go into the mix? GP - Shared services with SYHA at the current location make this option more difficult but will look at this option again

---

Alan Bratney – what has been done to work on the public transport provision up ‘til now? Currently one bus per hour, and can’t get bus back from Cairngorm at 3pm or 4pm

Maggie Lawson – consultation by Highland Council recently saw 2 sessions very poorly attended, closing date has passed for contracts for next 5 years. Only option would be to negotiate with a transport provider on a commercial basis

PC – CNPA have met with Highland Council, Sustrans etc, recognise the need for public transport, as do business residents, it is a big issue. we need to sort it, but there is not a quick solution

---

---

Alan McKay – Natural Retreats have a plan, CNPA have a plan but do they communicate?

Janette Jansson – Natural Retreats and CNPA communicate well and are talking to all stakeholders including Scottish Government. This is ongoing so is not publicised, working together to benefit the wider community not just NR – a joined up approach

---

---

We will feed into the consultation responding formally, we encourage you to do the same