Response No.	Туре	Name	Support for Loch Alvie	Support for Wade Road	Other view	Summary of issues raised
39	Community Council	Aviemore & Vicinity Community Council	LOCII AIVIE	Yes		Wade Road option is the traditional route, is more accessible, safer, quieter and more direct.
20a and b	Community Council	Kincraig and Vicinity Community Council		Yes		Supports the proposal to leave Aviemore on B9152 in order to better accommodate cyclists and horse riders and walkers in all weather; Proposes that Badenoch Way between Shinty pitch and Creag Far leitir be adopted as "walkers only" loop
17	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus /	Concerns over issues adjacent to house and business at Invereshie
29	Individual			No	Opposition to Wade Road, no alternatives suggested	Concern over impact to privacy and safety from route passing close to cottage that has been in family ownership for many years.
32	Individual			Yes		Road noise and nuisance from traffic make Wade Road option preferable; Road option on Wade Road to start of the track is not good and track option is better although a route along the river side would have been best.
40	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	Objects to Wade Road option as route would pass close to garden boudary and across front gate. Path would also cross bogland and end up on a busy road.
41	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	Concern that the consultation process in not fair, open and thefore not valid by excluding the Rothimerchus / Inshriach option. Dalraddy to Kinrara is noisy, dirty and unpleasant at walkers would avoid the path by walking along the road.
42	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	Rothimurchus / Inshriach have well established facilities for walkers, bird watchers and visitors. A9 dualling would have an inevitable impact on a route chosen on west of river. Potentially up to 2000 people living adjacent to the end of the Kinrara drive with consequential impacts on Kinrara estate.
43	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	Both current route options are contrary to principles of long distance routes - that is to be able to walk in natural habitat and countryside; Both current options would be expensive create, have greater impact on wildlife and will be less easy to facilitate disabled access Either option is close to a busy road and railway line and follows high voltage power lines Rothiemurchus / Inshriach is more scenically attractive and less expensive to develop.
44	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	
45	Individual			Yes		Wade Road option is marginally better than the alternative as it is less noisy, but neither are scenically attractive.

						Paper 3 Annex 4 01/12/06
Response No.	Туре	Name	Support for Loch Alvie	Support for Wade Road Yes	Other view	Summary of issues raised
1	Individual			Yes		

•						

Response No.	Туре	Name	Support for Loch Alvie	Support for Wade Road	Other view	Summary of issues raised
27	Individual			Yes		Impacts on privacy, farming and sporting activities; Future duelling of A9 would result in another route having to be found where it passes below the cliff.
28	Individual			No	Opposition to Wade Road, no alternatives suggested	Concerns over impact on wildlife (especially the unique value of the Bogach) from cyclists and litter being left; No alternative suggested other than to keep the route away from this area.
37	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus Inshriach	Has no objection to the route passing through at Loch Insh as there is no sense in having two separate routes so close together; Route is mis-named as it is not sufficiently near the River Spey; There is the need to ensure that there are suitable toilet facilities.
38	Individual				No preference	Concerns over issues adjacent to house and business at Invereshie
16 a, b, c, d	L				Preference for Rothiemurchus Inshriach	Conflict with decision of Public Inquiry Reporter over the Dalraddy Holiday Park / development; Lack of compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act and Nature Conservation Act in relation to Ospreys; Concerns about cost of implementation in relation to alternatives; No means of ensuring people will stick to the route; Concerns that route would discriminate against disabled people and is not suitable for multiple use; Effect on capercaillie on Rothiemurchus/Inshriach routes have been overstated.
5	Individual			Yes		It should be possible to find a better solution to the Aviemore end of to Wade Road option that sticks closer to river; Agrees with the all of the advantages identified in the consultation paper while fencing will deal with most of disadvantages;
6	Individual			Yes		Agrees with the summary of issues in the consultation paper.
15	Individual			Yes		Concerns over impact on jobs, health and safety of users, privacy issues for residents; difficulties with underpasses; potential difficulties if A9 is upgraded to dual carriageway. Wade Route option is more attractive generally.
34	Individual				Preference for Rothiemurchus Inshriach	Correct line of Wade Road runs to west of railway apart from short section near its /southern end; Wade Road option would encourage use by tourists from Aviemore and Dalraddy Caravan Park who would not be walkers or country lovers and therefore more likely to create noise (particularly at night), swearing and dropping litter; Concerns about who would police the route; Wade Road option would be most expensive to maintain an would be prone to ice in the winter; Concerns that passing below high tension power lines would not be attractive to users.
2	Land manager				No preference	Concerns about potential for users straying onto the railway line; Maintenance issues and liabilities would require further detailed discussion.

Response No.	Туре	Name	Support for Loch Alvie	Support for Wade Road	Other view	Summary of issues raised
19a ,b	Land Manager				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	Adverse impacts on commercial value of estate, on sport shooting, on privacy and security and land management operations generally; Proximity to road and effects of traffic noise from B9152 on users; Costs of implementation; Potential impact on shooting and associated activities; Environmental and ecological concerns, especially disturbance to Ospreys; Potential impact on viability of local business involved in shooting and sporting activities; Lack of vehicle access or parking; Current level of use of the area; Potential increase in insurance premiums; Wade Route option would conflict with findings of public inquiry into the permission related to Dalraddy Holiday Park in January 2002.
23	Land manager			Yes		Loch Alvie option is poor for horse access and proposed developments on A9 will mean more lorry use of the Dalraddy steading road to access the quarry; Loch Alvie option will have more impact on residents' privacy and will be a much more expensive option; Wad Road option provides opportunities for greater historical interpretation, has less impact of livestock, wildlife and shooting. Car park at Dalraddy may need extended.
31	Land manager				Preference for Rothiemurchus / Inshriach	Adverse impact on shooting and consequently on people's livelihoods; Health and safety issues for walkers and other users; Expense of construction and risk of flooding of route Impact on agricultural operations and on some species; Difficulty for proposed route if the A9 is ever converted to dual carriageway; Traffic noise; There would also be serious impacts on privacy for at least 10 permanently occupied houses and walking so close to such houses would not be comfortable for users; economic, safety, and security issues;
35	Land manager				Neither route option favoured and no alternatives suggested	Concern for the safety of children; Difficulty in managing livestock as underpass is often used as a holding pen; Problems likely to occur with dogs in proximity to cattle on both routes; Both routes would present bother and worry.
9	Non Governmental Organisation	Scottish Sports Association			No preference	
10	Non Governmental Organisation	RSPB			No preference	Unaware of any birds of conservation concern in close proximity to either route option; Increased disturbance to birds will not be a serious issue
21	Non Governmental Organisation	Paths for All Partnership			No preference	Risks associated with use of road margins, especially on Wade Road option; Traffic nois may be greater on Loch Alvie option; Need to consider linkages to other routes and networks and this may influence the final choice.
30	Non Governmental Organisation	Sustrans		Yes		Wade Road option provides most direct route, with historical association and less dominated by the main road and road noise. Also likely to be of more utilitarian use, less impact on farm operations, more room to construct a high multi-use specification with les steep gradients. Other details suggestions for route modifications given.

Response No.	Туре	Name	Support for Loch Alvie	Support for Wade Road	Other view	Summary of issues raised
33	Non Governmental Organisation	Ramblers Scotland		Yes		Arguments in favour of Wade Road option are strong while arguments against are not insurmountable; Roadside solution could be found for first section near Aviemore with the creation of a wide margin of grass or shrubs; Could be used as a good demonstration of an off-road route linking Aviemore to other communities.
36	Non Governmental Organisation	Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society		Yes		Wade Road Option is more direct, does not cross the A9 twice, has less road noise, has historical links and will be subject to less traffic noise; It has history of public use in the past; It will be most attractive to local and long distance users;
4	Public Body	Forestry Commission Scotland			No preference	Neither route option would have impact on land holdings and therefore not appropriate to comment.
7	Public Body	The Highland Council		Yes		Wade Road option is more direct and is the current desire line. Loch Alvie option is circuitous and may encourage users to shortcut along the road (B9152) raising safety issues.
14	Public Body	Spey Fishery Board			No preference	No concerns about either route.

	_

~~~~	 	 	

]	
-	
_	
-	

Cairngorms National Park Authority Paper 3 Annex 4 01/12/06