
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING held at the Grant Arms Hotel, Grantown-on-Spey on Friday 21st December 2012 at 10.30am

PRESENT

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Peter Argyle | Bill Lobban |
| Duncan Bryden (Convener) | Eleanor Mackintosh |
| Katrina Farquhar | Willie McKenna |
| Jeanette Gaul | Fiona Murdoch |
| David Green | Martin Price |
| Kate Howie | Gordon Riddler |
| Gregor Hutcheon | Gregor Rimell |
| John Latham | Brian Wood |

In Attendance:

| | |
|------------------|----------------------|
| Will Boyd-Wallis | Bob Grant |
| Stephanie Bungay | Jane Hope |
| Pete Crane | Hamish Trench |
| Murray Ferguson | Francoise van Buuren |
| Andy Ford | |

Apologies:

Angela Douglas
Dave Fallows
Mary McCafferty

Welcome and Introduction

1. Duncan Bryden welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Minutes of Last Meeting – approval

2. The minutes of the meeting on 26th October were approved with minor editorial changes.

Matters Arising

3. Paragraph 9: further consideration had been given to indicators 4 and 5 so that these now read as follows:
 - a) KPI 4: increased number of skills development/training days delivered to meet the ~~demands~~ needs of land management and business in the park.
 - b) KPI 5: increase in number of conservation volunteering days available through partner ranger services (from 900 days in 2010/11).

Declarations of Interest

4. None

Developing the CNP Brand Identity and CNPA Corporate Logo (Paper 1)

5. Pete Crane introduced the paper which presented the case for simplifying the Cairngorms National Park Authority corporate logo, as well as enhancing the use of Gaelic on any new design. The paper also considered options for enhancing Gaelic on the Cairngorms National Park Brand identity and the consultation undertaken about these options. It was noted in the introduction that the Cairngorms Brand had proved successful and the intention was to build on this over the coming years. As part of clarifying the use of the Brand by all partners, it was proposed that the CNPA's own corporate logo should be changed accordingly so that it did not appear to be providing an alternative visual image for the Cairngorms. This had not been an expensive piece of work, but it provided clarity for future juxtaposition of the Cairngorms National Park Brand and the CNPA's corporate logo.
6. Feedback from partners was clearly suggesting that the National Park Brand worked well and the message was "don't mess it up". The development of the Cairngorms Brand had been based on testing with the public back in 2004 and it made sense to stick with what the public had reacted well to. The CNPA logo had never been subject to the same degree of public attitude testing. Over the years a number of different versions of the CNPA logo had emerged because of the demands, among other things, of providing electronically generated letterheads. The logical conclusion was to use the National Park Brand and the CNPA logo together but this did not work with the two very pictorial images. Noting that partners were increasingly joint branding (displaying the National Park Brand identity along with their own corporate logo, showing clearly that they were a partner in the National Park) the time had come for the CNPA to adopt a similar approach. The logic was therefore to simplify the CNPA corporate logo to make it easier to use alongside the Cairngorms Brand. This would also provide the opportunity to incorporate the use of Gaelic more explicitly.
7. Having reviewed the Cairngorms Brand there was no proposal to change this in any way other than look at enhancing the Gaelic by increasing its size slightly. However, it

was emphasised that the use of the bilingual brand would be entirely the choice of the user; businesses and other users would be able to use whichever version of the brand they preferred – bilingual or English.

8. If Members accepted the change to the CNPA corporate logo the suggestion was that letterheads, business cards etc. would only be changed on a replacement basis, thereby minimizing cost.
9. The Board was therefore asked to approve a revised CNPA bilingual corporate logo; and approve a minor change to the CNPA brand identity.
10. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) Commercial organisations felt strongly they wanted to be able to choose whether to use the bilingual or English only Cairngorms Brand. It was confirmed that this was the proposed approach.
 - b) A number of comments were made about the proposed change to the CNPA corporate logo, noting with regret the loss of the blue mountains image, but indicating a preference for Figure 3.
 - c) A number of comments were made indicating Members were happy with the proposal that there should be an enhanced Gaelic version of the Brand alongside the English only version.
 - d) Having two pictorial images for the area did not work easily. Added to this the proposals marked an important step in clearly distinguishing the Park Authority from the National Park. The CNPA was a partner in the Cairngorms National Park along with many other partners; the proposal helped to reinforce that logic.
 - e) The CNPA did not need an image; it made sense for the predominant image to be that for the Park as a whole as represented in the Cairngorms Brand.
 - f) In practice the CNPA corporate logo was used in a fairly limited way on letters, compliment slips, fleeces, business cards, and grant award panels.
11. Willie McKenna stated his wish not to lose the original CNPA corporate logo given that the Cairngorms National Park was essentially about mountains. He abstained from any decision and asked for this to be recorded in the minutes.
12. **The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:**
 - a) **Agreed a change to a revised CNPA corporate logo as shown in Figure 3 at Paragraph 14.**
 - b) **Approved the changes to the CNPA Brand identity as shown at Figure 8 at Paragraph 29, incorporating enlarged use of Gaelic wording.**
 - c) **Agreed that where the CNPA used the CNP Brand identity the bilingual version should be the preferred option but that the CNPA should still have the ability to use the English version if there were a specific need. Other users of the Brand would be able to choose whether to use the English only or the bilingual version.**

Capitalising on the Year of Natural Scotland and the Cairngorms National Park's 10th Anniversary in 2013 (Paper 2)

13. Stephanie Bungay introduced the paper which updated the Board on communications work to support the Year of Natural Scotland as well as the Cairngorms National Park's 10th Anniversary. The two themes would be used to engage, support and encourage partners to get involved in helping to promote the Park. A proposed programme of events, activities and resources were recommended which aimed to capitalise on the Year of Natural Scotland as well as the Park's 10th Anniversary to build stronger partnerships and encourage others to help promote the Park, in line with the organisation's communications and engagement strategy. The proposed programme was deliverable within existing resources; if Members felt additional lines of activity were desirable, this would mean finding additional resources from other areas of the Operational Plan.
14. In discussion the following points were made:
- a) Board Members should expect to get involved in the range of activities.
 - b) 2013 was also the 150th Anniversary of the Railway being extended from Pitlochry to Aviemore. This may provide an additional focus for events in 2013.
 - c) There was some discussion about the 10th Anniversary logo which Members were disappointed with, and asked to be revised.
 - d) 2020 Vision was a nature photography project which aimed to raise the understanding of the natural world. It comprised a number of stage exhibitions and road shows. Discussions were in progress about an adaptation of this that was specific to the Cairngorms National Park in 2013.
 - e) That 2013 was Year of Natural Scotland and the National Park's 10th Anniversary was a happy coincidence and a good opportunity. Involvement of Board Members was essential and a request was made that opportunities to get involved were well publicised around the organisation.
 - f) Eight key themes were set out at Paragraph 2. It was important to ensure that the programme of events contributed to each of these.
 - g) Board Members could be a useful sounding board in developing the Park case studies (Paragraph 17(f)). In any event Members should know as soon as possible what the case studies would be.
 - h) It was noted that the events were not just about what the CNPA could do, but what partners could deliver, as well as making sure that all the events were about promoting the National Park.
 - i) The actual anniversary of the creation of the National Park was the 25th March. There was some discussion about how this should be marked. One proposal was securing a feature in a National Newspaper. Nevertheless the proposals were generally focused on something softer and more gradual than a big bang event, recognising there was a balance to be struck between organisational self promotion and the promotion of the Park.
 - j) It was important to capture the learning points from the 2013 events.

- k) We should be asking what we want people to remember from the events.
- l) Also need to ask how to make the biggest impact with limited resources. There needed to be a moment or an event when everyone in the Park felt part of something.
- m) There needed to be a complete spread of events across the National Park.
- n) It was suggested we should find ten Park champions to champion activities.
- o) The suggestion was made of a hot air balloon which would be able to look at the Park from the air. This was likely to attract media interest.
- p) The imaginative and wide ranging programme was welcomed.
- q) Concern was expressed about leaving some things to communities and the burden this might create. It was important that Members were involved in helping to promote events and encouraging and helping communities to take part.
- r) In respect of Paragraph 23, it was noted that the business community had provided assurances that the Park Aware programme would happen by March.
- s) At Paragraph 26, it was asked whether the suggested additional activities had been considered and discounted or were still possibilities. It was noted that these were not included within the resources available and therefore if Members wished to pursue any of these, or indeed additional activities, further resources would need to be found from the Operational Plan. There was some discussion about the possible use of the Branded trailer at (c) where the resource implication was more about manning it and moving it around the Park than creating it in the first place.
- t) The question of which message was most important (Year of Natural Scotland versus 10th Anniversary) was asked in the context of possible mixed messages. There was a Scottish Government initiative to support the Year of Natural Scotland; the 10th Anniversary provided an opportunity to approach communities and get them involved in the Park. But both were in essence about an opportunity to build partnerships, develop ambassadors, and develop a real appreciation and understanding of the National Park and its opportunities and benefits.
- u) This was essentially a national campaign but we needed to consider the opportunities of making it more international in its approach, for example using ANPA and Merrell. Merrell (outdoor clothing manufacturers) had a partnership with the Association of National Park Authorities. They had not delivered as much as they had hoped and in 2013 in the late spring/summer they were going to focus their attention more on National Parks. The proposal was for the CNPA to feed in stories so that we could maximise the profile obtained through the Merrell marketing of UK National Parks.
- v) It was noted at Paragraph 13 there would be no formal launch of the Year of Natural Scotland; this was regarded as a missed opportunity.
- w) It was right to celebrate the 10 years of the National Park although the CNPA needed to be careful about managing that, avoiding any implication that we were celebrating our own existence.

- x) The question was posed what one would be left with at the end of 2013 – most obviously the notion that the National Park is beneficial, therefore messages about successes over the 10 years had to touch as many people and as many communities as possible. It was also important to develop a sense of optimism about what to look forward to in the future as a result of the establishment of the National Park.
- y) The question was asked whether the sale of maps could be expanded. There were five versions but only two had been marketed. It was noted that the challenge was to link the sale of the maps into the Visitor Payback Scheme which was still work in progress. So far the sales had been administered through the CBP and this was continuing with the two views – there was no obvious demand for the other views.
- z) A number of businesses had benefited from the creation of the National Park and it might be possible for these to help to promote the 10 Year Anniversary through branded foods, beers, whisky etc.

15. The Convener summed up the discussion with the following points:

- a) 10th Anniversary logo needed more work;
- b) Further thought needed for a signature event for the 25th March while avoiding being self congratulatory;
- c) Ensure geographical spread of events;
- d) Look into possibility of 10 park champions;
- e) Make Members aware of the proposed ten case studies (but don't expect Members to be involved in editing and choice);
- f) Consider international dimension;
- g) Decide on the legacy; the two to three messages we want people to be left with. Would be useful for Members to have so they can use at events during the year;
- h) It was agreed that possible events at Paragraph 26 would not be progressed.

16. **The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:**

- a) Noted the progress made to date and approved the proposed programme for 2013, subject to further thought being given to the points made in Paragraph 15 above;**
- b) Agreed that the programme was sufficient and further/additional investment was not appropriate.**

Dualling the A9 in the Cairngorms National Park (Paper 3)

17. Bob Grant introduced the paper which updated the Board on how the dualling of the A9 would be taken forward in the National Park and sought advice on principles that the CNPA would wish to have incorporated in the design. It also highlighted the likely staff resources required to achieve these aims. Members were given the Transport Scotland leaflet which set out the details of the proposed project. This was a huge project for Transport Scotland; the A9 from Perth to Inverness comprised 110 miles

with 80 miles requiring to be dualled. The aim was to complete the dualling between Perth and Inverness by 2025.

18. The approach to the project was “design and build” which necessitated all the constraints and objectives to be identified at the outset of the project. This then formed the basis for the tendering of the contact. The Board paper set out the key principles at Paragraphs 8 and 9 which would be used as the basis for feeding into the Transport Scotland consultation. Particular attention was drawn to the following:
 - a) Deer collisions as a significant issue; possibly Paragraph 8(e) should be expanded to be more specific on this.
 - b) As set out at Paragraphs 10 and 11, in the past there had been policies in place to prevent commercial development on the A9, instead directing traffic into local communities. Those policies had now lapsed and the Board was invited to take a view on whether the CNPA should continue to promote the same principles.
 - c) The staffing resource implications were potentially significant as set out at Paragraph 17.

19. It was noted that improving the transport infrastructure did not just concern the A9, as the Highland mainline was also being looked at with a view to reducing the overall journey time by 30 minutes. There were proposals to put double track in place. From February 2013 there would be an opportunity to be engaged in that consultation also.

20. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) The principles set out at Paragraph 9 were welcomed and it was proposed that three further issues could be added to these: noise (reduce the impact of noise through choice of surfaces); crossing the A9 by horses; lighting.
 - b) There might be opportunities to influence signage that helped people to enjoy the Park and find their way around it. This included signage to the A9 as well as on it.
 - c) The aim should be to restrict vehicle access points onto the A9; it was agreed that Paragraph 8(f) was not intended to imply otherwise. The intention was that there should be easy access to crossing points for animals and bicycles through bypasses etc. as opposed to onto the A9 itself.
 - d) It was noted that dualling did not necessarily make roads safer; there were currently more accidents on the Sterling to Perth section (dualled) than on the Perth to Inverness section. The objective of dualling the A9 was claimed to be reducing accident severity and it was noted that this should aim to reduce the number of accidents not just their severity.
 - e) The CNPA should be emphasising the need for good lay-bys with plenty of space especially if there was a viewpoint. Provision of interpretation would also be helpful. Where there was a lay-by number a National Park marker/sign should be added to this to raise the profile of the Park.
 - f) As far as services on the A9 itself were concerned it seemed likely that there was not sufficient traffic to justify commercial service areas.

- g) This was an ambitious project. It was noted that the A96 was also to be dualled around the same time, another major project.
- h) Paragraph 8(b) and 8(c) referred to good views from the road; it was pointed out that there was a corresponding need to screen the road from others. There was therefore a balance to be struck.
- i) It was probably necessary to ensure that communities and business associations were aware that the policy in respect of no services on the A9 had lapsed. They could then take a view on whether they wished this to be reinstated.
- j) Advertising Hoardings needed to be avoided.
- k) There may be a role for the NPA to help with facilitation during the consultation.
- l) This was a very long term project.
- m) It was suggested the CNPA should write to Community Councils offering support if this would be helpful. It was important that the CNPA was able to take a view on the provision of services on the A9. Murray Ferguson and Hamish Trench were asked to bring something back to the Board on this subject for the Board further consideration.
- n) There was plenty of international experience of putting dual carriageways through National Parks; this should be flagged up to Transport Scotland.
- o) Paragraph 8(e) on provision for wildlife crossing should be expanded to explicitly include deer.

21. Bob Grant responded to some of the points as follows:

- a) Addition to be made to 8(a) about enjoyment of the National Park.
- b) Transport Scotland were concerned about signage clutter and were concerned to concentrate on functional signage.
- c) Transport Scotland were looking at flyovers and underpasses to reduce the amount of turning across the traffic thereby ensuring safer routes.
- d) 8(f): this was intended to put down a marker that it was important to ensure people don't have to travel a long way simply to get on to the A9. It does not mean that every village has to have its own access point.
- e) Lay-bys. The policy now is that there must a separation/embankment. As a result there are likely to be fewer lay-bys. The CNPA will wish to influence where they are so we can ensure good interpretation. The aim will be to have fewer, but better, lay-bys.
- f) The CNPA had good links into communities and would therefore look for mechanisms for updating communities on the progress with the consultation. CNPA would use its contacts to ensure that views were fed back into Transport Scotland.
- g) It was noted that the CNPA had good working relations with Transport Scotland.
- h) It was not the case that people were preferentially directed up the A9 from south of Perth.

22. **The Board approved the recommendations of the paper as follows:**
- a) **Noted the scale and timeline for the completion of the work;**
 - b) **Approved the key principles that the CNPA would wish to be incorporated in the project as set out at Paragraphs 8 and 9 but adding in the points made during discussion (paragraph 20 and 21 above);**
 - c) **The Board to consider further the merits of roadside, commercial development; on the basis of a further paper;**
 - d) **Approved the staff resource to engage fully at each stage of the project.**

Audit Committee Annual Report (Paper 4)

23. Jane Hope introduced the paper which presented the Audit Committees Annual Report to the Board. The Board took ultimate responsibility for the activities of the CNPA and it was therefore essential that they were aware of and content with the Audit Committee's work. The paper reported on the activities of the Audit Committee over the period September 2011 to September 2012, and was based on the report presented to the Committee by the Authority's internal and external auditors.
24. Final accounts for the year ending 31st March 2012 had been signed off by the end of June 2012; there had been a clean Audit report and Audit Scotland concluded that all key control systems within the Authority operated satisfactorily. The annual internal audit report was to the effect that the Authority's systems provided "reasonable basis for maintaining control and that the control framework provided reasonable assurance regarding the effective achievement of strategic objectives". No critical internal audit recommendations had been raised over the course of the year.
25. **The Board:**
- a) **Noted the content of the report;**
 - b) **Agreed the satisfactory discharge of the Committee's responsibilities over the year.**

Cairngorms Nature Action (Paper 5)

26. Andy Ford introduced the paper which updated the Board on progress with the Cairngorms Nature Action Plan, and sought comments to inform any necessary revisions prior to further consultation and finalisation in March 2013. It was noted that this Plan was in the ownership of the Cairngorms Nature Strategy Group – it was not the CNPA's Plan. As with the National Park Plan, only some of the actions were for the National Park Authority; it was in essence a partnership Plan. Partners were engaging well in coming together and offering comment on the Plan. The next step was for the Strategy Group to consider comments made on the Plan, with a formal consultation (along with the Strategic Environmental Assessment) to follow. The final draft would go to the Strategy Group for approval in late March 2013. The ratification

of the CNPA Board would be sought in April, with the launch of the Action Plan in May 2013.

27. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) This was an impressive piece of work. The drafting was clearly aimed to make the document engaging and accessible.
- b) On page 12 of the document four aims were set out for the Action Plan. These included inspiring people and providing opportunities. However, this was not just the general public, and it was suggested that the document needed to explicitly mention naturalists and researchers etc. Bio-security also needed to be explicit in the aims. Rangers were not mentioned but they were also key partners.
- c) There was some discussion about CNPA's responsibility in respect of the Action Plan. It was emphasised that the Plan was being led by Cairngorms Nature and the associated partners. In that sense it was similar to many other plans such as the Sustainable Tourism Strategy and the National Park Plan. The CNPA clearly had an interest but it was not the sole deliverer and was not solely responsible. That was the essence of partnership.
- d) While the drafting of the Action Plan was welcomed and the attempt to set out a vision on page 8 was likewise welcomed, there was concern that the wording of the vision appeared to be pre-empting an approach to reintroductions. It was agreed that the vision helped to bring the document to life but it must not pre-empt decisions still to be made. This needed further consideration, noting that the document was welcomed as very readable.
- e) The question was raised about whether the Plan was proactive enough about flood alleviation. Catchment management was clearly important. Should the Action Plan be used to in effect campaign for funds to do work which alleviates flooding downstream out of the National Park? This was acknowledged as a valid point and one that was covered in the National Park Plan. It may not be for the Cairngorms Nature Action Plan therefore. It was important to make connections but equally to recognise the limits of this particular Plan.
- f) It was suggested that the idea of biodiversity as a tool for managing ecosystems needed to be incorporated. Community and economic wellbeing is delivered through biodiversity. It was suggested that a fifth people-centred (Page 12) aim was needed in this respect.
- g) Attention was drawn to page 20 and the issues of deer management. It was noted that deer issues needed a higher profile and would have their own section. This would highlight the role of CDAG (Cairngorms Deer Advisory Group).
- h) The current issue of ploughing up peatland was raised. There were no powers to prevent this. There may be a role for Cairngorms Nature in raising the profile of unhelpful activities such as this, and campaigning against them.
- i) The issue of invasion by grey squirrels was noted as important.
- j) It was suggested that the document should clarify the context of the Plan, the role of partners, and what the Plan can and can't do.

28. The paper was noted as being one for discussion; points made by the CNPA Board to be fed back to the Cairngorms Nature Strategy Group and used as appropriate.

Land Management Training Project Update (Paper 6)

29. This paper was for information only.

AOCB

30. Timings of meetings. The Convener clarified that all Board meetings would have a target of a 3.30pm finish time. In discussion it was also noted that this might depend to some extent on the location of the Board meeting for those who were tied to public transport.
31. Feedback on activities. There was some discussion about how Members could best feed in an account of their activities. A template for this was provided and in future the Convener would summarise the contributions and circulate these to all Board Members, in advance so that Members could concentrate on reporting at meetings only the most significant of their activities and most importantly, the implications.
32. Capital investment. It was noted that the Park Authority had been successful in attracting further Scottish Government money for “shovel ready” projects. Further details and a press release would be issued shortly.

Date of Next Meeting:

33. Next formal meeting: 15th February 2013, Grant Arms Hotel, Grantown-on-Spey.