

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
9	Tulloch Moor Road- Would like to see the Tulloch Moor Road included as it is a popular cycle route and there is an on-going issue with a flooded section.	Objection	Reject	<p>The Park Authority historically doesn't support the adoption of large sections of the road network regardless of whether they are adopted or not. The Reporter for the last round of consultation removed the road section of the route at Dorback as it lies at a distance from the nearest communities, services and public transport and does not provide links between them. The same argument would apply here as in effect this route does not join up the existing core path network or wider path network. It joins up one public road with another. It is the view of the CNPA that the route doesn't fit well with the objectives.</p> <p>The issue of the flooded section of track is being addressed in partnership with the Nethy Bridge Community Council who do not support the inclusion of this route.</p>	Objection with drawn

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
15	Tulloch Moor Road- Would like to see the Tulloch Moor Road included as it is a popular cycle route and there is an on-going issue with a flooded section.	Objection	Reject	<p>The Park Authority historically doesn't support the adoption of large sections of the road network regardless of whether they are adopted or not. The Reporter for the last round of consultation removed the road section of the route at Dorback as it lies at a distance from the nearest communities, services and public transport and does not provide links between them. The same argument would apply here as in effect this route does not join up the existing core path network or wider path network. It joins up one public road with another. It is the view of the CNPA that the route doesn't fit well with the objectives.</p> <p>The issue of the flooded section of track is being addressed in partnership with the Nethy Bridge Community Council who do not support the inclusion of this route.</p>	Objection with drawn

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
16	<p>Cairngorms Local Outdoor Access Forum</p> <p>Overall, the CLOAF informal discussion was that the Highland Perthshire core paths should be transferred, as they are, to the CNPA responsibility.</p> <p>Discussion on the Thieves Road, GR17, between Loch an Eilein and Feshiebridge, was generally in favour of the addition. It had not been included in the 2010 Plan due to environmental sensitivities – but it was now recognised that management of sensitive sites would be assisted by core path designation.</p>	Representat ion	NA	Park staff welcome the support from the LOAF for the inclusion of the Thieves Road	NA
23	<p>Map 16: Missing paths:</p> <p>(1) close to LBS 142, a new path is the old school path, much used by all, leading from the Old School to Inveraglas;</p> <p>Map 17: Paths missing:</p> <p>(1) Round Loch Gynack via Pitmain Lodge joining UBS 34 ;</p> <p>(2) From UBS 34 to Ballachroon and to West Terrace, Kingussie</p> <p>Map 1 : Central Cairngorms</p>	Objection	Reject	<p>Map 16 - Reject new route adjacent to LBS142 as it does not fit well with the objectives. The existing core path within the woodland meets the communities and famers needs better.</p> <p>Map 17- Reject extension to UBS34 around Loch Gynack as it doesn't provide any linkage between the communities.</p> <p>Reject link from UBS34 to West Terrace as it is over provision and wouldn't help those working on the land accommodate access.</p> <p>Map 1- Reject all of this linking routes between Glen Tromie and Kingussie and Glen Tromie and Glen Feshie as they don't</p>	Objection withdraw n

Annex I - Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	<p>Paths Missing</p> <p>(1) From Glen Tromie at Allt Bhran to Glen Feshie above Glen Feshie Lodge; (2) Path from Alchlean in Glen Feshie to the waterfall; (3) Path from Achlean in Glen Feshie to Cam Ban Mor; (4) Path signed by Scottish Rights of Way Society at Ruthven a) to the Tromie at Glen Tromis Lodge b) to the Tromie north of Lynaberack Lodge; (5) Path from B970 on west side of Tromie to Glen Tromie Lodge - much used by dog walkers.</p>			fit well with the objectives and there is a presumption against core paths in the uplands.	
31	Jocks Road: The Core Paths Plan for the Cairngorms / Eastern Cairngorms (pp 109-111) should be amended to add as a Core Path the existing route known as 'Jock's Road'.	Objection	Reject	There is a presumption against upland paths being in the CPP unless they are robust in nature and provide strategic links across the Park. At present this need is met by EC11.	Local inquiry
53	<p>Seven Bridges, Ballater: A new footbridge over the River Gairn, at Foot of Gairn, now gives access to a safer walk, away from the A93. It also brings users closer to the banks of the Dee, adding interest, with its special wild life and flowers.</p> <p>I would like the core path plan updated to include the Alternative Route for the Seven Bridges Walk from</p>	Objection	Accept	This route fits well with the objectives so subject to land owner support this route will be added.	Objection with drawn

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	Ballater.				
55	<p>Glen Fearnach path, ref MTBL/102.</p> <p>In summary, I am concerned about three aspects of this proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The effect of increased foot access on our obligation under the Beinn a Ghloe SNH Deer Management Plan to cull more deer. 2. Peat erosion, as is happening on nearby Carn Liath from foot traffic. 3. The proposed path starts two miles up an existing private road with no vehicle access or parking facilities. 	Objection	Accept	This route does pass through a remote upland area on a mixture of informal paths. It does not link to any communities or core paths on the Park side.	Objection with drawn

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
56	<p>Tulloch Moor Road: To formalise this route as a Core Path, I think is not only unnecessary, but could likely lead to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased usage (in addition to my comments about the knock-on effects for Tulloch of recreational overspill from Am Camus Mor). • increased disturbance and impacts on flora & fauna on a designated site (the moor currently holds an already vulnerable black grouse lek, breeding curlew, woodcock, whinchat & stonechat, among others) • increased impacts on grazing stock • creation of yet another sanitized, signpost-led, mapped and website-ed experience • it could serve to legitimise the moor road / Tulloch area, through wider third-party promotion, for other uses, like wild camping and camper-vanning (with associated issues of toileting, fire risk, dogs off leads and litter). • the possibility of it becoming used for formalised events - cycle road races etc. 	Representat ion	NA	The CNPA is not supporting the inclusion of this route.	NA

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
62	<p>Tulloch Moor Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • negative impact due to increased cyclists, visitors and dog walkers in particular to areas of common grazing and farmland, where sheep worrying is already an issue • negative environmental impact on flora and fauna in an area. For example the already fragile and declining populations of black grouse are increasingly becoming the focus of visitor's attention. • Unsuitable infrastructure for traffic. The Tulloch Moor road is not suitable for traffic, let alone increased traffic. Repairing a small part of the road would not make it safe. For example there is no provision for passing places, and the numerous blind bends and humps can make this a dangerous road. • Negative impact on the well being of the Tulloch community and environment. Tulloch is already a very popular and busy place for tourists, bird watchers, cyclists, walkers etc - increased use of the moor road would encourage further damage not only to the environment but we believe also to the feel of the area. 	Representat ion	NA	The CNPA is not supporting the inclusion of this route.	NA

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
67	<p>Tulloch Moor Road: Would like to see the route included for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ease of speedy access for emergency vehicles of all sorts 2. Ease of access for surrounding residents (the presence of the road avoids lengthy detours to visit local people within the community) 3. Access by residents and visitors alike (cyclists, walkers, bird watchers, joggers etc.) to a special area of the national park (the north facing lee of the Kincardine Hills) 	Objection	Reject	<p>The Park Authority historically doesn't support the adoption of large sections of the road network regardless of whether they are adopted or not. The Reporter for the last round of consultation removed the road section of the route at Dorback as it lies at a distance from the nearest communities, services and public transport and does not provide links between them. The same argument would apply here as in effect this route does not join up the existing core path network or wider path network. It joins up one public road with another. It is the view of the CNPA that the route doesn't fit well with the objectives.</p> <p>The issue of the flooded section of track is being addressed in partnership with the Nethy Bridge Community Council who do not support the inclusion of this route.</p>	Objection with drawn
70	<p>Angus Council: Given the above no formal objection should be made to the Proposed Core Path Plan.</p>	Representat ion	NA	Noted	NA

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
II 6	<p>Tulloch Moor Road:</p> <p>We object to the Tulloch Moor road being designated as a Core Path in the Cairngorms National Park and also any repair to the road at the deep puddle.</p>	Representat ion	NA	The CNPA is not supporting the inclusion of this route.	NA
II 7	<p>Tulloch Moor Road:</p> <p>We object to the Tulloch Moor road being designated as a Core Path in the Cairngorms National Park and also any repair to the road at the deep puddle.</p>	Representat ion	NA	The CNPA is not supporting the inclusion of this route.	NA
4	<p>Proposed Core Path Network within Ballater. Re-route a section of UDE29</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proprietors at Cornellan are concerned at the number of people that congregate by the wall, leaving cigarette ends, spent coffee cups and other rubbish. • Private gardens are also accessed by members of the public. • Some vandalism has taken place and threats made against proprietors who have spoken to those involved. • Proprietors of Cornellan and three other adjacent properties would like this access to the river closed off • In the winter heavy amounts of snow has to be cleared by hand and invariably the only place it can be 	Objection	Reject	The realignment of UDE29 would affect the sufficiency of the plan because the route is popular was well supported during the development of the Core Paths Plan and fits well with the objectives.	Local inquiry

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	put is in the corner by the bridge which obstructs the steps over the river.				
5	<p>Tulloch Moor Road: The route should be included because:</p> <p>It has always been a very well known popular route for cycling and walking for many years. Down the Sluggan over Tulloch Moor past Forest Lodge and through the Ryvoan Pass back to Glenmore.</p>	Objection	Reject	<p>The Park Authority doesn't support the adoption of large sections of the road network regardless of whether they are adopted or not. The Reporter for the last round of consultation removed the road section of the route at Dorback as it lies at a distance from the nearest communities, services and public transport and does not provide links between them. The same argument would apply here as in effect this route does not join up the existing core path network or wider path network. It joins up one public road with another. It is the view of the CNPA that the route doesn't fit well with the objectives.</p> <p>The issue of the flooded section of track is being addressed in partnership with the Nethy Bridge Community Council who do not support the inclusion of this route.</p>	Objection with drawn

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
6	<p>Tulloch Moor Road: The route should be included because:</p> <p>It has always been a very well known popular route for cycling and walking for many years. Down the Sluggan over Tulloch Moor past Forest Lodge and through the Ryvoan Pass back to Glenmore.</p>	Objection	Reject	<p>The Park Authority doesn't support the adoption of large sections of the road network regardless of whether they are adopted or not. The Reporter for the last round of consultation removed the road section of the route at Dorback as it lies at a distance from the nearest communities, services and public transport and does not provide links between them. The same argument would apply here as in effect this route does not join up the existing core path network or wider path network. It joins up one public road with another. It is the view of the CNPA that the route doesn't fit well with the objectives.</p> <p>The issue of the flooded section of track is being addressed in partnership with the Nethy Bridge Community Council who do not support the inclusion of this route.</p>	Objection with drawn
95	<p>Upland Paths:</p> <p>There should be a clear statement that, while existing paths should be maintained, there will be no new core paths in areas of high or medium wildness value.</p> <p>“Multi use by legitimate forms of outdoor access is encouraged. Legitimate forms of access on paths include walking, cycling and horse riding.” This is too lax for core paths in the central Cairngorms: mountain</p>	Objection	Modify	<p>Redraft plan on page 108:</p> <p><i>These paths pass through an area of challenging terrain and conditions can be such that people need to be self-sufficient and well equipped. There is a presumption against designating a large network of paths in the upland areas and areas of high wilderness value. Those paths designated are the linking</i></p>	Objection withdraw n

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	<p>biking over the Larigs Ghru and an Laoigh, for instance, should be discouraged as “irresponsible”, since they damage path surfaces as well as encourage off-path use of bikes on even more fragile surfaces.</p> <p>Endorse the policy that there should be no signage in the central Cairngorms area and suggest that this is extended to all areas of high and medium wildness value, except in woods.</p>			<p><i>routes which are already well used and well known. They all have green and white 'Right of Way' signage at either end and appear in a variety of leaflets and books about the Cairngorms. In the Outdoor Access Strategy there is a presumption against way-marking in wild, remote and mountainous terrain and there would be no further signposting or way-marking of these paths as a result of core path designation. Visitor pressures, such as erosion from certain activities will be managed in a sensitive way to protect the fragile environment, manage landscape impact and will follow best practice in upland path repairs.</i></p>	
98	<p>Highburnside path, Aviemore</p> <p>AVCC objects to LBS124. AVCC have supported the path in the past but not as a Core Path, preferring LBS145 as an alternative. AVCC does not consider that LBS124 fulfils the objectives of a Core Path. It goes from High Burnside to The National Nature Reserve and to the south end of Aviemore. It does not have any other connections. There is uncertainty over the dualling of the A9 and it is more than likely that the dualling will affect LBS124. LBS145 on the other hand has connections to North Aviemore, High Burnside, The Speyside Way, the Entrance to the National Nature Reserve and many others into Aviemore.</p>	Objection	Reject	<p>Fundamentally LBS124's exclusion would affect the sufficiency of the Plan. The basis for this is that the route, when developed, clearly addresses the need identified during the initial development of the Core Paths Plan by improving the quality and experience of the “Aviemore Orbital”, and by providing an alternative route as well as a link for resident of Highburnside to access the Craigellachie National Nature Reserve. It will also provide a good alternative route to manage the public</p>	Local inquiry

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	LBS145 easily fulfils the requirements of a Core Path and is unlikely to be affected by the dualling of the A9. AVCC supports LBS145.			away from the sensitive sites in Kinveachy Forest. It fits well with the Action Area Priorities identified in the Outdoor Access Strategy as well as having the potential to meet public policy objectives such as reducing car dependency and increasing levels of physical activity.	
10 2	<p>Nethy Bridge Community Council</p> <p>Would like the recent new path and bridge over the Duack Burn taking villagers and those using the Speyside Way off the B970 at a dangerous road bridge to be included on the map.</p>	Objection	Accept	Accepted- LBS116 should be amended to go over the Duack Bridge as this is the new route of the Speyside Way. Tulloch Moor Road comments noted	Objection with drawn
10 9	<p>Core paths on Capercaillie sensitive sites</p> <p>LBS13 (Map 11). There are 5 proposed core paths in Anagach Wood. This woodland is designated as an SPA for supporting a population of European importance of capercaillie. This path is in an important part of the wood, passing within close proximity of the main breeding area. There is already a strong body of evidence from research carried out at Anagach which demonstrates that capercaillie avoid areas of suitable habitat within 200m of tracks.</p> <p>GR17 (Map 23). This path passes within close proximity of some of the most productive brood habitat for</p>	Representat ion	NA	The routes highlighted were subject assessment which concluded that designation would not have an effect on designated species.	NA

Annex I - Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	capercaillie in Scotland. Capercaillie produced in this forest are likely to move to other woodlands in the Badenoch and Strathspey metapopulation, including the suite of designated SPA's. We believe that any promotion of this path, which has no formal promotion currently, could lead to increased recreation and have a negative effect on the breeding success of capercaillie.				
11 5	Tulloch Moor Road: We object to the Tulloch Moor road being designated as a Core Path in the Cairngorms National Park and also any repair to the road at the deep puddle.	Representat ion	NA	The CNPA is not supporting the inclusion of this route.	NA
17 5	Seafeld Estate The Estate objects to the River Spey crossing point core path on the grounds of lack of need. Any development at Rothiemurchus is still be a long way away with the court case to be resolved, a s.75 agreement to be negotiated and a significant amount of up front infrastructure works to be designed and paid for before any development could start. Glenmore road end and will take many years to evolve towards the vicinity of the river. The	Objection	Accept Reject and Accept	We do not support the removal of the Spey bridge on the grounds that there is a clear evidence for the need to link An Camus Mor to Aviemore and that a bridge would be needed early in the communities development to foster a more sustainable approach to travel and manage the public away from the sensitive woodlands around the site. We do not support the removal of the	Local inquiry

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	<p>The estate objects to the inclusion of a proposed path linking High Burnside to Craigellachie NNR. The Estate has consistently objected to this route for various reasons and these are well documented.</p> <p>Carrbridge Core Paths: The Estate objects to the inclusion of a route of a proposed path to the west of Lochanhully. There is no existing path here and the vegetation, topography, proximity of Lochanhully lodges and grazing livestock mean that the establishment of such a route does not look likely within the plan period.</p>			<p>Highburnside Path (LBS 124) as its exclusion would affect the sufficiency of the Plan. The basis for this is that the route, when developed, clearly addresses the need identified during the initial development of the Core Paths Plan by improving the quality and experience of the “Aviemore Orbital”, and by providing an alternative route as well as a link for resident of Highburnside to access the Craigellachie National Nature Reserve. It will also provide a good alternative route to manage the public away from the sensitive sites in Kinveachy Forest. It fits well with the Action Area Priorities identified in the Outdoor Access Strategy as well as having the potential to meet public policy objectives such as reducing car dependency and increasing levels of physical activity.</p> <p>We are happy to remove Carr Bridge core path at Lochanhully on the grounds of deliverability and natural heritage implications.</p>	

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
18 8	<p>Sport Scotland:</p> <p>We recommend that the position outlined in bullet 6 of paragraph 13.5 should be amended. This seems to suggest that a core path can be developed as long as it can be demonstrated that no other viable development option is available. We suggest that a core path should only be allowed to be developed where appropriate mitigation has been agreed – e.g. provision of a new route or acceptable diversion of an existing route. Where this cannot be satisfactorily achieved the Park should be willing to refuse applications that will have a negative impact on core paths.</p>	Objection	Modify	<p>Amend text on page 107 to state <i>Include a wide range of popular routes- core paths must be incorporated into developments to maintain access across and round the development. Where your proposal may affect the line of a core path you must discuss alternatives with the Access Authority early and prior to submission of your planning application.</i></p>	Objection with drawn
22 0	Nestrans also welcomes the inclusion of the Core Paths Plan as supplementary	Representat ion	NA	Noted	NA
22 2	<p>Tulloch Moor Road</p> <p>We are not in favour of the road being designated core path. Tulloch's roads are increasingly used for leisure purposes by walkers, cyclists, runners, road skiers and various vehicles both motorised and manually driven. This raises concerns re: accidents, fire danger, littering, disturbance to wild life, criminal activity e.g. oil thefts, livestock thefts, dog worrying, poaching and petty thieving, all on the rise, as is , as a result , increased outlay in fencing, security lighting, locks and police activity. A price for development?</p>	Representat ion	NA	The CNPA is not supporting the inclusion of this route.	NA

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
22 3	<p>3 Core Paths Plan – Supplementary Guidance - Paragraph 13.23</p> <p>Omitted from Newtonmore Core Paths are:1. Fisherman's trod beside the Spey (left bank) from the Wildcat Trail to the Dell of Kingussie.2. Hill path over Creagh Dubh (part used by Highland Games hill race route).3. Hill paths to the high Monadhliath (ie A'Cailleach and Carn Dearg) used by munro baggers.</p> <p>13 Core Paths Plan – Supplementary Guidance - Paragraph 13.6</p> <p>Historic Minigaig Pass (from Glen Tromie to Blair Atholl) omitted</p>	Objection	Reject	<p>Reject - (1)The Riverside path between Kingside and Newtonmore was considered early on in the last round of consultation but was rejected as both LBS80 and UBS34 provide adequate links between to two communities. (2) There is a presumption against designating upland paths, this route doesn't not fit well with the objectives as it doesn't provide for a range of actives or link communities. (3) There is a presumption against designated upland paths. (4) There is a presumption against designated upland paths. The need to link Badenoch with Atholl is adequate met by the Giack pass and the NCN 7 route. The Minigaig is a very high level route that is ill-defined for much of its length.</p>	Objection with drawn
22 8	<p>Highburnside, Aviemore</p> <p>I support the Aviemore Core Paths as proposed. It is especially important to have core paths on both sides of the new A9, as having limited crossing points already make access into Craigellachie NNR and other areas important for recreation and active travel on the west side of the A9 tricky for those staying in the north half of Aviemore. In particular the building of the core path demarcated from High Burnside to Craigellachie NNR</p>	Representat ion	NA	Noted as support for the continued designation of LBS124	NA

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	<p>would be extremely welcome by the communities in the north end of Aviemore, especially for those who have small children/tight lunch hour recreational opportunities etc and who cannot make the long journey along the road to the other end of Aviemore</p>				
<p>23 6</p>	<p>Historic Scotland</p> <p>HS welcomes the aim of the core paths plan to help to encourage people to enjoy the cultural heritage within the Park in a responsible way.</p> <p>Scheduled Monuments</p> <p>Any works proposed to create new or improve existing paths through the legally protected area of a scheduled monument would require the prior written consent of Scottish Ministers (scheduled monument consent) under Section 2 of the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.</p> <p>Properties in Care</p> <p>Historic Scotland should also be consulted on any proposals to upgrade or carry out physical works to</p>	<p>Representat ion</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All future development works would be subject to relevant planning processes.</p>	<p>NA</p>

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	<p>any paths within the boundary of any properties which are within the care of Scottish Ministers and maintained by HS on their behalf.</p> <p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Any works directly affecting a listed structure will require Listed Building Consent. The planning authority should consult HS on works affecting the setting of an A-listed structure.</p> <p>Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes</p> <p>Proposals to upgrade core paths which pass through designated gardens and designed landscapes, which follow the line of existing paths, should be informed by the existing, often original, path structure. Proposals for paths which have no historic precedent should be very carefully considered to ensure that they will not significantly impact upon the visual integrity of a particular area or threaten the viability of important trees or planting.</p> <p>Inventory Battlefields</p> <p>Battlefields are a unique resource with complex archaeological and landscape components.</p> <p>They also provide opportunities for interpretation and</p>				

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	<p>battlefield trails. However, proposals for new or upgraded paths may require to be considered carefully in order that impacts on any surviving archaeological remains are addressed appropriately. Any such proposals should be discussed with the relevant planning authority archaeological advisor in the first instance.</p> <p>Signs</p> <p>For proposed signage that may lead to works on a scheduled monument, HS recommends early consultation. Under Section 2 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, any works within the scheduled area, for example temporary fencing, installation of gates and sign posting, can only be carried out with the prior written SMC. In the case of paths which lie within or adjacent to properties in the care of Scottish Ministers</p>				
255	<p>Kincraig and Vicinity Community Council:</p> <p>We are aware that the route of the extension of the Speyside Way from Aviemore to Newtonmore has been signed off by Ministers. We therefore suggest that the route now be shown with a different symbol on the Core Paths maps (Kincraig & Insh in particular), so as to</p>	Representat ion	NA	Noted	NA

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	show which Core Paths will be subsumed and which will not.				
28 3	<p>The Thieves Road</p> <p>The GR 17 route is within Rothiemurchus Estate for a distance of 1.2 Km and is managed by the estate. It is a narrow and rough path used by those seeking a quiet experience away from bikes etc.</p> <p>If it were to become a core path it would be likely to be much more widely promoted by social media as a part of a circular biking route linking Aviemore, Kincaig and Kingussie changing its character and the experience on the most popular neighbouring paths to the detriment of existing users. Existing regular users would be likely to make other paths nearby which would be likely to have a detrimental effect on ground nesting birds and other wildlife. It would cease to be the very high quality experience that it is now.</p> <p>It would therefore be incorrect to claim that designation would have little effect on the use of GR17 and it would therefore in our view be contrary to the habitat regulations to designate it without taking into account the likely increased numbers and range of use that designation is likely to create and carrying out the</p>	Objection	Reject	<p>It is our view, which is supported by SNH that core path designation in itself will not result in a significant increase in users. This is because the core paths plan is not a promotional document. It is primarily a planning document helping us and others to direct resources to the paths that need it the most. As core path designation does not confer any greater access rights it has not really entered in the general public mindset.</p> <p>Both our and SNH's assessment of the route concurred that designation of the route would not have a significant impact on the designated features of the SPA. Both our assessments highlighted that designation, as a tool, would ensure that proper resources are dedicated to managing the public on the path and away from sensitive areas. This view was supported by the LOAF who advised us that designation of the route should be</p>	Local inquiry

Annex I - Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
	necessary mitigation.			used to manage the public on the site.	
28 4	<p>SNH</p> <p>Para 13.5</p> <p>1st bullet point - This refers to 'consent' being required for signage and track improvement to paths. It is unclear if this is referring to planning permission or some other form of consent.</p> <p>Clarification of what 'consent' is being referred to, and additional text as suggested to explain the procedure for works that would normally be permitted development in relation to Natura sites.</p>	Representat ion	Accept	Amended Para 13.5 to refer to planning permission. Other comments noted	

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey

ID	Summary	Objection/ represent ation	Accept/ reject/ modify	Reason	Inquiry
28 5	<p>Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group</p> <p>Object to the following core paths due to potential adverse impacts of recreational disturbance on capercaillie.</p> <p>LBS 11,13,16, Anagach Woods</p> <p>LBS116 Mondhuie</p> <p>LBS 53 Docharn</p> <p>LBS 67,69 Boat Wood</p>	Objection	Reject	The routes you would like to see removed from the plan are already promoted both with signage and in leaflets. LBS116 is also the Speyside Way a formal long distance route designated under the Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967. It is our position the de-designation of these routes is unlikely to have any significant effect on their current use by the public. The Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Local Development Plan and Core Paths Plan confirms this view. It is our position that the designation of these routes gives us a focus for supporting the management of access along these routes for the benefit of Capercaillie.	Local inquiry
28 7	<p>UED30, Craigendarroch Circular Walk.</p> <p>Much of this route could be challenged as justifiable Core Path status, because upgrading to the required standard would spoil its character. I consider it should not have been given such status. My preference would be to downgrade this route, i.e. remove Core Path status from it.</p>	Objection	Reject	Core path designation allows for a variety of paths to be designated from grass paths right through to public roads. UBS30 can remain a core path in its current state.	Local inquiry

Annex I- Objections and representations to the revised Core Paths Plan

The outstanding objections are highlighted in grey