

Annex 1

CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE SPEYSIDE WAY

1. Background

The current route of the Speyside Way, from Buckie to Aviemore with spurs to Duftown and Tomintoul, was opened in April 2000. Since before that time there have been calls for the route to be extended to Newtonmore, to enable the villages in Badenoch to benefit from the access opportunities afforded and also from the economic input of route travellers. Following an investigation and appraisal of a number of options for extending the route, a 'preferred route' was selected by the Speyside Way Management Group on the basis of an evaluation exercise and put out to public consultation to gauge the level of support. Led by the Cairngorms National Park Authority, the consultation on the proposed extension to the Speyside Way began on 13th December 2004 and ran until 25th March 2005.

The consultation was carried out by sending documents (a description of the preferred route, a map and a covering letter) to a wide range of individuals and public bodies, including all potentially affected landowners, community councils and other community groups, other interested bodies (both local and national) and local politicians. In addition, notices were put in the local press, documents were available for perusal at local post offices and Service Points and the consultation package was available for download on the Speyside Way website, with links from the Cairngorms National Park website. Over 80 packages were sent out initially, with further copies being sent on request. Members of the Speyside Way Management Group also attended meetings with landowners, land managers and community bodies at their behest. Comments were received by letter, email, telephone and in face to face discussion.

A total of 56 responses were received and these have been looked at closely in conjunction with the views made known during a number of meetings with potentially affected landowners and other interested parties.

2. Summary of responses

The consultation paper asked three questions:

- 1. Are you in favour of extending the Speyside Way?**
- 2. Are you in favour of the rationale used to evaluate the route options?**
- 3. Do you support the line of the preferred route?**

Taking these in order:

1. Are you in favour of extending the Speyside Way?

The overwhelming answer was 'yes', with 34 respondents giving positive responses and no negatives.

2. Are you in favour of the rationale used to evaluate the route options?

Responses to this question were more varied. Most respondents (30) made no comment, 8 respondents commended the approach used, and 16 questioned the scores given, with several of those giving a detailed breakdown of how they themselves would have scored the routes. It had been recognised at the start of the consultation that this would be a challenging

question to deal with given that the scoring was, of necessity, subjective in nature although based on the knowledge and experience of members of the Speyside Way Management Group. It was acknowledged that if the rationale was disputed, any revised scoring could alter the 'preferred route', opening the validity of the consultation to question. However, it was decided that as people had been encouraged to offer alternatives to the 'preferred route', these could be broadly evaluated as part of the consultation analysis. If perceived to offer advantages over the 'preferred route' they should be further investigated in conjunction with the relevant landowners and land managers. Of those who questioned the scoring used, 5 made alternative suggestions which have been given full consideration.

3. Do you support the line of the preferred route?

Support for the 'preferred route' varied. Only two respondents gave an outright 'no'. 15 respondents supported it wholeheartedly or with minor qualifications, while 10 had problems with particular sections. A total of 28 respondents suggested alternative routes or variations, some of which had been considered already and others of which were new. One of the benefits of the consultation process was that it enabled the input of local experience, which might not otherwise have come to the fore. However, it is important to remember that the Long-Distance Route is a national designation and has to fulfil certain criteria, and local aspirations have to be set in the context of the overall picture. Many people put forward their own ideas of what long-distance walkers require, which were not always corroborated by the Speyside Way Route Manager. It is also worth noting that the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 was enacted during the consultation period, and will have a considerable influence on the choice of route and how and for whom it is managed. The main effects of the legislation are to open up access to responsible users. This means that well made, signed paths can play a useful part in land management, encouraging people to take access along particular routes and allowing access to be integrated with day to day land management operations.

Analysis of the responses was carried out in some detail. Responses were coded with an alphanumeric identifier which consisted of a sequential number followed by a letter relating to the type of respondent (see appendix 1). Attributable quotes (in italics) and suggestions were included in a table (see appendix 2). They were then considered individually and assigned to one of five categories:

- Accepted – we agree with this comment and will take this on board
- Reflected – the route should be adjusted to reflect, but not accept in full, the comments;
- Rejected – the route should not be adjusted. e.g., change would affect the Accepted or Reflected comment or there are other reasons why this suggestion cannot be implemented
- Managed – whilst we cannot incorporate this comment into the decision on the final route, it will be tackled in our consideration of wider implementation issues e.g. location/ type of signage, management of potential interaction between route users and land management.
- Noted – the comments made are not necessarily relevant to this consultation but should be revisited as and when further progress is made with the route.

This approach has been used successfully with the 2004 analysis of consultation on the Scottish Outdoor Access Code.

The analysis has been carried out using the route sections identified and outlined in the consultation papers.

3. Analysis of responses: section by section

E: Aviemore to Dalraddy

This was probably the most contentious of the route sections put forward for consultation. This was not unexpected, as part of the land crossed has not hitherto been managed for public access, and therefore local knowledge of it was limited. Further complications were added as a consequence of the sale of Kinrara estate, which has still not been concluded and may yet have an important bearing on the line chosen.

Of those who made comments on this section, 22 were unhappy with the route proposed. Significantly, this included one of the estate owners, an agent for a prospective estate owner and several tenants. Of those who offered alternatives, there was widespread support for the general principle of a route following the line of the old Wade Road through Kinrara Estate. This had earlier been evaluated as 'option D' and a number of potential problems had been identified. However, on the basis of the responses received, it is recommended that this option be looked at again. A route not previously considered, along the north shore of Loch Alvie, was also suggested, and it is recommended that this too be looked at, as it may potentially avoid the problems associated with both options D and E.

F: Dalraddy to Kincaig

There were few comments on this part of the preferred route and no opposition. It is therefore proposed that this section is accepted as put forward.

G: Kincaig to Feshiebridge

Six respondents felt that this did not follow the best route. Most of the comments referred to the section following the claimed right of way between the Invereshie Farm road and Feshiebridge. Although it is concluded that there are no real grounds for reconsidering this section, there are land management considerations which suggest that the alternatives offered should be evaluated. In particular a route variation put forward by Forestry Commission Scotland and echoed by others, linking the end of the Kincaig shinty pitch section of the Badenoch Way with forest tracks behind Balnеспick Farm and omitting Feshiebridge altogether, may prove to be a better option than the preferred route and further investigations and discussions are already under way.

J: Feshiebridge to Tromie Bridge

Three different parts of this option were challenged by respondents. Apart from those who favoured the route described above, three respondents felt that the route should not go via Uath Lochans, although the reasons for this: either a desire to keep it 'secret', a perception that route users would prefer a more direct route, or a wish to use the whole of the Badenoch Way are not considered sufficient to justify changing a section which potentially adds charm and interest to an otherwise fairly lengthy forest stretch. Further along this route, the residents of Inveruglas raised concerns about loss of amenity and wear and tear on the path surface. However, given that this section is a long-standing and attractive right of way, and that wear and tear due to route users would become the responsibility of the managing authority, it is not felt that an adjustment is warranted.

Several respondents have mentioned the Badenoch Way and questioned the reasoning behind its proposed use for the Speyside Way in some parts but not in others. The Badenoch Way was conceived as a local route, and although it could be argued that it was the lack of a Speyside Way extension which catalysed its development, there are parts of it which would not meet LDR criteria without substantial work which would tend to take away some of its

charm. It is felt by the Speyside Way Management Group that by developing a 'fit for purpose' LDR this would add to the walking opportunities in the area, opening the way for circular routes and an alternative route when forestry operations were being carried out.

L: Tromie Bridge to Ruthven

Very few comments were made on this section. A meeting has been held with RSPB to clarify the proposed route through their land, and it is recommended that a further attempt is made to find a way of avoiding the B970.

N: Ruthven to Newtonmore

Several respondents did not like the idea of using the Sustrans cycle track between Kingussie and Newtonmore, and 9 suggested alternatives going via Loch Gynack above Kingussie. While it is accepted that this would be an attractive route, early investigations revealed potential difficulties with integration of land management and it is suggested that the pragmatic approach will be to utilise the Sustrans route to enable earlier completion of the extension, while keeping the Loch Gynack route as an aspirational goal for the future. Interestingly, this approach is supported by Newtonmore Community Council who were instrumental in driving forward the current initiative. Concerns voiced, mainly at public meetings, that LDR users would not bother with the Newtonmore/ Kingussie stretch if it is on the cycle route are not considered to be credible, as experience suggests that completion of the route from end to end is the aim of most whole route users, and this could be encouraged further by a good terminus marker.

4. Conclusions

There is strong support for the extension of the Speyside Way between Aviemore and Newtonmore. The preferred route did not meet with universal approval over its whole length however, and the consultation process has generated a number of suggestions which merit further consideration. In particular, suggestions and alternatives proposed by land owners and managers which may facilitate the integration of the route with other land management objectives should be followed up. Some respondents expressed opinions that the new access legislation means that the concerns of land managers can be ignored in the light of greater freedoms of access. However, paths still need to be managed and by working together in a spirit of responsibility, no-one should be disadvantaged and indeed everyone should benefit.

The following route is suggested:

Aviemore to Dalraddy:

- look again at the line of the old Wade Road through Kinrara Estate, including links with Aviemore.
- consider 'new' route on west side of Loch Alvie as proposed by Savills

Dalraddy to Kincaig:

- follow preferred route

Kincaig to Feshiebridge

- look again at route put forward by Forestry Commission and others from the shinty pitch to the forest road behind Balnespick, omitting Feshiebridge.

Feshiebridge to Tromie Bridge

- subject to route changes in the previous section, follow preferred route (including Uath Lochans) with some minor alterations as suggested by Forestry Commission

Tromie Bridge to Ruthven

- look to revise preferred route slightly in consultation with landowners

Ruthven to Newtonmore

- follow preferred route

Where a 'different' route is proposed, there will be a need for full consultation with landowners and other interested parties who will have the opportunity to contribute to any decision.

5. Next Steps:

To be decided by the Speyside Way Management Group.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Coding of Respondents

Landowner

- 1a The MacLaren Webster Partnership (Kinrara)
- 2a Savills (Kinrara)
- 3a Jamie Williamson (Alvie and Dalraddy)
- 4a Jane Williamson (Balnespick)
- 6a Forestry Commission Scotland (David Jardine)
- 8a John Barton (Drumguish)
- 9a RSPB (Carl Mitchell)
- 10a W A Cowan (Gordonhall Farm)

Occupier/ tenant

- 5b Peter & Susan Philpott (Invereshie Estate)
- 51b Robin McLaren (Kinrara)
- 55b Duncan & Karen McBain

Adjacent landowner

- 18c Marjory Cleary (Lynwilg) (Kinrara)
- 26c Scripture Union Scotland
- 53c Helen Gillies
- 56c Ruaraidh Ormiston

Community Council

- 11d Newtonmore & Vicinity Community Council
- 12d Kingussie Community Council
- 13d Aviemore & Vicinity Community Council
- 14d Kinraig & Vicinity Community Council

Other community body

- 7e Hamish Swan (Inveruglas Residents Association)
- 15e Newtonmore Community Woodland & Development Trust

Public body

- 16f Scottish Natural Heritage
- 17f Paths for All
- 27f **Sportscotland**
- 29f Highlands of Scotland Tourist Board
- 35f The Highland Council
- 37f Sustrans
- 47f Scottish Sports Association
- 49f Visitscotland
- 54f NFU Scotland

Interest group

- 19g British Horse Society Scotland
- 20g The Ramblers Association
- 21g Highland Foundation for Wildlife (Roy Dennis)

- 31g Highland Cycle Forum
- 39g Badenoch Riding Club
- 45g Cyclists Touring Club Scotland
- 48g Scotways

Individual

- 22h John Borrowman
- 23h Anne Wakeling
- 24h Donnie Ross
- 25h Charlie McAlinden
- 28h John Campbell
- 30h Bill Greaves
- 32h Peter Evans
- 33h Clive Freshwater (Loch Insh Watersports)
- 34h J Rathbone (Lynwilg Cottage, Kinrara)
- 36h A D Mackintosh
- 38h Alan Hunt
- 40h Brian R Paterson
- 41h Caroline Leaver
- 42h Derek Emsley
- 43h Sue Jeffrey
- 44h Jim Hall
- 46h John Davison
- 50h Caroline and John Leaver
- 52h Kenneth Taylor

Communications before consultation (*also responded to consultation)

- * Richard Scarffe (Scripture Union)
- Duncan & Karen McBain
- Nat Hone
- * Carl Mitchell (RSPB)
- Kingussie Golf Club
- * J Rathbone
- Savills (Pitmain Estate)
- * Clive Freshwater

Appendix 2: Analysis of Consultation Responses

Are you in favour of extending the Speyside Way?		
Yes	11d, 14d, 15e, 3a, 4a, 5b, 6a, 9a, 16f, 17f, 18c, 19g, 20g, 23h, 24h, 25h, 26c, 27f, 28h, 29f, 31g, 35f, 36h, 37f, 38h, 39g, 41h, 42h, 43h, 44h, 46h, 48g, 49f, 53c	
No		
No comment	13d, 12d, 1a, 2a, 7e, 8a, 10a, 21g, 22h, 30h, 32h, 33h, 34h, 40h, 45g, 47f, 50h, 51b, 52h, 54f, 55b	
Are you in favour of the rationale used to evaluate the route options?		
Yes	15e, 16f, 17f, 18c, 19b, 20g, 23h, 49f	
No		
No comment	13d, 12d, 2a, 4a, 7e, 8a, 9a, 10a, 21g, 22h, 24h, 25h, 29f, 30h, 31g, 32h, 33c, 34c, 36h, 39g, 40h, 41h, 42h, 43h, 44h, 45g, 47f, 50h, 54f, 55b	
Comments:	On scoring	3a, 5b, 6a, 28h, 37f, 48g, 51b, 53c
	Other	11d, 14d, 1a, 27f, 35f, 38h, 46h, 52h
Do you support the line of the preferred route?		
Yes (whole route)	16f, 19b, 29f, 35f, 39g, 49f	
Yes (qualified)	11d, 12d, 8a, 9a, 17f, 21g, 27f, 34h, 45g	
Difficulties with particular section(s)	7e, 10a, 26c, 33h, 38h, 43h, 50h, 51b, 56c	
Alternative suggested	13d, 14d, 15e, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5b, 6a, 7e, 18c, 20g, 22h, 23h, 24h, 25h, 30h, 32h, 36h, 37f, 41h, 42h, 44h, 46h, 48g, 52h, 53c, 54f, 55b	
No	1a, 28b	
No comment	31g, 40h, 47f	

INDIVIDUAL SECTIONS:

E: Aviemore to Dalraddy

Principal Land Owner(s) McLaren Webster Partnership, Savills (for prospective purchaser),
Jamie Williamson (Alvie and Dalraddy Estates)

Land Manager(s) Trunk Roads Authority, Duncan McBain

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
No comment			
In favour	16f, 34h, 39g		
Not in favour: no alternative suggested	1a	Partnership opposed to currently preferred route and each of the other routes proposed that bisects Kinrara on grounds of economic, ecological & environmental impact	Reflected: the stance of the owners is noted
	15e	<i>The Trust believes that a better route could be found via the Kinrara Estate</i>	Noted
	26c	<i>.... We have significant concerns about the preferred route from Aviemore to Dalraddy because of its proximity to the Alltnacriche perimeter fence. While we are confident at present of being able to assure parents, teachers and group leaders of the security of the Centre, we could not be assured of this when members of the public are encouraged into the immediate area. Unwise in view of the increased risk, and is potentially fraught with difficulty.</i>	Managed: while not integral to the consideration of the route, these comments need to be taken on board and addressed

	51b	<i>I am very much afraid that the ??? preferred route, currently the only one under consideration, about which, until published, no-one seems to have know anything at all, is a non-starter. This is because sales particulars ... specifies the existence of a pheasant shoot, a duck flight pond and also claims a deer cull of 35 stags per annum....</i>	Noted: respondent may have misunderstood the point of consultation
	23h	<i>Taking the path alongside the A9 verge is unacceptable for quality of route and visitor experience and would be very unpleasant and possibly hazardous walking</i>	Managed: point noted, and alternatives will be looked at, but we are advised by HC Roads & Transport that this is acceptable and will anyway comprise only tiny portion of whole LDR
Not in favour: alternative suggested	2a	<i>We consider that the best route is to follow the old line of General Wade's road, as this will have a minimal impact on any land management activities. (Option D)</i>	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully
	2a	<i>We have also identified a further route that has not been considered ... we would urge the Park Authority to look at this alternative seriously. ... while this route still has an effect on the Estate's activities, it is greatly reduced</i>	Accepted: this suggestion should certainly be taken seriously (this refers to a suggested route along the north shore of Loch Alvie)
	3a	Aviemore Police Station to Allt na Criche Burn: 2 alternatives suggested	Reflected: these suggestions will be evaluated should Option E be rejected.

	3a	Allt na Criche Burn to Dalraddy Holiday Park. Option D preferred, for reasons of: desire line, visitor experience, environmental sensitivity, social & economic benefits, capital expenditure and multi-use, land management & links to community path networks	Reflected: some of the points made are valid and will be considered should Option E be rejected
	4a	<i>Why go east and add a rather unnecessary loop that will cause disturbance to livestock, forestry, not to mention how many gates would have to be provided..... To the west side of the old A9 there is a route on General Wade's road. This is historic and information could certainly interest a lot of the public.</i>	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully
	13d	<i>We feel a lot of work and funding will be required Our preferred route would be Option D which we feel is the most direct route.</i>	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully
	14d	<i>The Altnacreich loop is not meeting support (cost, pheasant shoot and fails the SROWS test for LDRs) the popular choice without question is Option D</i>	Reflected: unsupported assumption on behalf of respondent, but nevertheless option D should be reconsidered

	18c	<i>..... Burma Road a steep climb and not easy for everyone. During the pheasant season, guns are out in this valley, including on the Alltnacriche Road. I feel there must be an easy way through Kinrara your Option D</i>	Reflected: there may be ways to manage this, but nevertheless option D should be reconsidered
	20g	<i>At the Aviemore end we would prefer to see the route more closely following the river and away from the main road (partly option C) passing between Kinrara and the river to link with the preferred route</i>	Rejected: although line unclear from description, earlier investigations in this area failed to find a coherent route. It is likely from the description that this suggestion would also pass close to an osprey nest.
	22h	<i>I object to the Option E 'loop' that passes Ballinluig as this alternative is inappropriate due to costs, difficult terrain and intrusion on existing occupied dwellings. I wish to register preference To follow the direct option which entails passing through Kinrara Estate</i>	Reflected: consultation did not ask for judgement on cost, plus route runs outwith the curtilage of buildings. However, reconsideration may be advisable
	23h	Option D (but with slight variation) Would be more likely to be multi-use	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully
	24h	... support extension going through Kinrara Estate close to the railway	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully
	36h	<i>The logical route south of Aviemore is indeed through Kinrara Estate, but alongside the river on the East side of the old A9, as implied by the name 'Speyside Way'.</i>	Noted: route suggested is not clear

	37f	... favour the following route option – B, J, L, N ... greater multi-use opportunity	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully
	46h	<i>Leaving Aviemore ‘penguin pool’ .. my preferred route would quickly take walkers off the townie tarmac ... through the Speyside Holiday Caravan Park to a new kissing gate/ bridge Thence by open fields .. to Lynwilg Cottage, then follow the old Wade road route to a new bridge-feature over the Bogach To Dalraddy</i>	Reflected: there are some potential problems with this proposed route. Specifications for path furniture will need to be ‘fit for purpose’.
	48g	<i>...the case for Option E has not been made, and that Option D, with a new start from Aviemore, will be much more acceptable to long distance walkers and will cost less both to create and to maintain.</i>	Rejected: reasoning is based on opinion of respondent both in terms of what is acceptable and what it will cost. However, comment is also noted.
	52h	<i>The route .. would be intrusive to the people who live in Lynwilg house and the other houses and Altnacriche Centre and Ballinluig Farmhouse, also this would be a very dangerous route. If they take the route from Aviemore to Dalraddy following the railway and Wade old road, the route would provide the user with a varied walk ... The Walk could be developed to the east or the west of the railway</i>	Reflected: although the route would run outwith the curtilage of houses, this is not a valid reason to change it. No grounds for thinking it might be dangerous once in place. However, comment re alternative route is noted.
	54f	<i>Follow the railway line between Aviemore and Kincaig (map supplied)</i>	Accepted: we will need to consider this again more fully

	55b	<i>... it would bring public through the working area of the farm ... crosses an area included in farm's ESA scheme, intrude on privacyif route could be found using lower ground of farm – eg between the A9 and Loch Alvie, subject to detailed agreement ... might be acceptable</i>	Reflected: this needs to be looked at
Additional comments	13d	<i>We agree with you that the preferred route above the moorland and birch woodland provides spectacular high quality views across Loch Alvie and Strathspey</i>	Noted
	20g	<i>Option E Could be a useful optional route to be used in case of flooding or other sensitive times for conservation interests Would also form a nice circular route out of Aviemore for shorter local walks if linked to the route we propose along the river.</i>	Noted
	21g	<i>I was grateful That you had ruled out option C.I remain certain that it would involve increased disturbance to the ospreys. And once people are told they are disturbing these birds they would be breaking the law if they continued.</i>	Accepted: it is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 to recklessly disturb a Schedule 1 species (osprey). Development and promotion of the route is an issue.
	22h	<i>... alternatively, via Rothiemurchus and Feshiebridge.</i>	Rejected: capercaillie presence means that reasoning above applies, as this is also a schedule 1 species.

	23h	Comments re locked gate on Burma Road, cost, farm dump and distance from Spey	Managed: these are all issues for consideration during implementation
	34h	<i>The walk from there (Burma Road) down via Loch Alvie gives an unrivalled view of the Cairngorms and would be well worth the 'dog-leg' at Lynwilg</i>	Noted
	38h	<i>Ospreys nesting on Kinrara Estate have sterilised what would have been an obvious and excellent route from Aviemore to the Badenoch Way ... there must be a choice of routes through the Estate that would keep people at a safe distance</i>	Noted
	46h	<i>Plainly your committee has been 'got at' by the McLaren – Dennis-SNH birdie lobby who kneel down in worship to the great god Osprey Wont disturbed ospreys just fly off to another tree?</i>	Rejected: it is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 to recklessly disturb a Schedule 1 species (osprey). Development and promotion of the route is an issue.
	46h	<i>I think I spotted a longcurly eared ant and a rare blue-spotty-bottomed moth out along the Ballinluig farm track! To have the public interfere with the habits of such hugely important endangered species is surely quite unacceptable PC?</i>	Noted

	48g	<i>We note that Option C is ruled out because of proximity to an osprey's nest. This seems to us an extreme reaction and we would want more explanation as to why this is necessary.....</i>	Accepted: it is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 to recklessly disturb a Schedule 1 species (osprey). Development and promotion of the route is an issue.
	52h	<i>How is it that Find the most difficult route possible? They have the perfect opportunity to make some of the Speyside Way disable friendly for wheelchairs and scooters...</i>	Noted

F: Dalraddy to Kincaig

Land Owner(s) Jamie Williamson (Alvie and Dalraddy Estates).....

Land Manager(s)

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
No comment			
In favour	3a, 16f, 39g		
Not in favour: no alternative suggested			
Not in favour: alternative suggested			
Additional comments	3a	Toilets should be considered at Kincaig	Managed: this should be borne in mind and considered further

G: Kincaig to Feshiebridge
Land Owner(s) Jamie Williamson (Alvie and Dalraddy Estates),
Occupier/tenant(s) Philpott (Invereshie House),
Forestry Commission Scotland Land Manager(s) David Jardine

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
No comment			
In favour	16f, 33h, 39g		
Not in favour: no alternative suggested	5b	<i>It is felt that the proposed route will severely detract from the privacy and enjoyment that we and our guests expect on Invereshie Estate</i>	Managed: this will be tackled in consideration of wider implementation issues, although access would be permitted under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003
Not in favour: alternative suggested	3a	Path parallel and close to road from Insh Church to tarred section of Badenoch Way	Reflected: this is an option for further consideration
	3a	Remove tarring on this section	Rejected: this would be difficult and is unlikely to be considered a good use of public money
	3a	Use existing Badenoch Way	Reflected: although some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use.
	3a	The route past Invereshie Farm is unacceptable. It goes close to ..steading where cattle are handled and up a track used for cattle handling. It goes close to or within the curtilage of Invereshie house and cottages.it runs within or close to the curtilage of Balcraggan House	Rejected: these are not grounds for realigning the route, particularly where it is already a Right of Way. However, these comments will be borne in mind should a re-evaluation be deemed necessary.

	3a	Invereshie Farm entrance to Creag Far-Leitire using route from shinty pitch across bank and exiting at public road junction, then through FCS woods to Track between Balcraggan and Balnespick	Reflected: this option is worthy of further consideration
	4a	<i>Why divert from Badenoch Way and head away from view over Loch Insh? ... take the route on the shinty pitch side of the road up the hill.....I have seen the FCS proposed route on the east of the B970 from the T junction above the watersports centre and feel that it is a good proposal with perhaps a jig here and there.</i>	Reflected: this option is worthy of further consideration
	5b	<i>I would question the reasoning why the proposed route is not to follow the existing Badenoch Way</i>	Reflected: although some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use.
	6a	<i>FCS remains to be convinced that the proposed route is a better option than the existing route of the Badenoch Way</i>	Reflected: although some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use.
	6a	<i>.....FCS wish to propose a route which has not been put forward in the consultation documents which overcomes most of the difficulties on routes G, H and J without introducing a significant number of new issues</i>	Reflected: this option is worthy of further consideration

	14d	<i>The condition of the short stretch of the present Badenoch Way round Insh Church is such as to require a considerable amount of work to make it suitable for the less fit, while it is subject to flooding from time to time. A suggestion is for an alternative path on the east verge of the road from the wicket gate Past the Church to meet up with the tarmac section of the Badenoch Way past the cemetery,</i>	Reflected: this is an option for further consideration
	14d	<i>If (Frank Bruce Sculpture Collection) fails to come to fruition, the 'Invereshie Glen Feshie loop' loses part of its justification. An alternative would be to Climb the hill at the end of the Shinty pitch, ... along the edge of the fields above the Watersports Centre to the T junction And through the Milehouse Wood.</i>	Reflected: this option is worthy of further consideration
	30h	A route along the NW side of Loch Insh should be investigated	Rejected: regular flooding and close proximity of road and railway make this a non-starter.
	30h	<i>.... From Kincaig.... At the end of the Shinty Pitch ... it should carry on up the hill on an old track and then cross the Feshiebridge Road into a forestry plantation, turn right therein run alongside the B970 as far as the last house and then cross the B970 and rejoin the Badenoch Way.</i>	Reflected: first part of proposal is worthy of further consideration, route alongside B970 would be a low priority.

	30h	<i>If the preferred route is still preferred: continue along the track from Mill Cottage on to the Feshiebridge road for a few yards & then up the path ... to join a forestry road which leads ... to a track at the end of which a slight detour could be made to connect to a path towards Craig Farleitre. Alternatively from the forestry car park below Mill Cottage, follow the path to Feshiebridge, cross the road on to a Right of Way for 650m where a path will be found going up the hill to the above mentioned forestry road</i>	Reflected: these options are worthy of further consideration if ‘preferred route’ is used
Additional comments	3a	Pedestrian walkway over Kincaig Bridge	Managed: recent attempts to do this have been unsuccessful, but it is recognised as an aspirational target.
	16f	Would prefer a path on the other side of the road from the Loch between Kincaig Bridge and Insh Church	Noted: the current proposals from KVDP have looked at this.
	33h	Notes that there has been discussion on potential alternatives to the proposed route, bypassing Loch Insh Watersports Centre and lists concerns re these proposals	Noted: this was not the subject of this consultation and is therefore irrelevant in the present context, but will be revisited should changes be deemed desirable.

J: Feshiebridge to Tromie Bridge

Land Owner(s) Forestry Commission Scotland, Jane Williamson (Balnеспick), Nat Hone (Invertromie Estate), Barton (Drumguish)

Land Manager(s) David Jardine (FCS), Inveruglas Residents Association

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
No comment			
In favour	8a, 16f, 37f, 39g		
Not in favour: no alternative suggested	53c	<i>...fantastic views to be had by utilising the Uath Lochans and Farletter Crag routes, I think that it is such a special area that people should discover the peace and quiet for themselves</i>	Rejected: this is not considered to be a valid reason for rejecting this option.
Not in favour: alternative suggested	3a	See previous section	
	3a	<i>We appreciate that both Feshiebridge and Uath Lochans are desirable places to walk and picnic these attractions would be better served by secondary paths coming off the main Speyside Way</i>	Rejected: these are not considered to be valid reasons for rejecting this option.
	6a	See previous section	
	7e	<i>.....likely loss of amenity value ... (to Inveruglas residents) may we ask you to consider an alternative route, along the forest track from Waney Edge to Drumguish.</i>	Rejected: this part of the preferred route follows the existing Badenoch Way and Right of Way (which was there before most of the houses were built)
	48g	Why not stick to the established Badenoch Way Route?	Reflected: some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use.

	50h	<i>We feel that the route Should keep as close to the Spey and Loch Insh as possible. If the closest possible route .. should be along the Badenoch Way then we feel it should follow the Badenoch Way. We do not like the proposed extension via Uath Lochans....</i>	Reflected: some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use. Comment re Uath Lochans noted.
	53c	<i>I am wondering why the proposed route is not following the existing Badenoch Way after leaving Kincaig. ..KVDP negotiated a detour .. a benched path directly opposite the (Watersports) Centre, ... crossing the B970 at the bellmouth ... FC waymarked Blue trail and direct route to Uath Lochans ...</i>	Reflected: some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use. Suggested diversion should be considered further.
	53c	<i>I would also question the route that follows the new forest road down to Waney Edge House ... a far better option is to follow down for another 40 m and catch the existing heather clad Badenoch Way....</i>	Reflected: some sections of the Badenoch Way are considered unsuitable for LDR use.
Additional comments	7e	<i>Inveruglas Resident's Association fund maintenance of the private access road to Inveruglaslegal access to Inveruglas properties and bears vehicular traffic which raises safety considerations</i>	Rejected: Speyside Way Management would bear the cost of any damage attributable to users. Vehicular traffic on proposed section through Inveruglas is probably less than 10 cars per day and not considered to be unsafe for LDR users.

	7e	<i>In the event of the proposed route being established a contribution to the Inveruglas Road Fund would be appreciated.</i>	See above
	8a	Would like to be consulted regarding signposting, resurfacing and any intended restriction on vehicular traffic	Accepted: landowners will be consulted further before route implementation
	53c	<i>We both feel that the proposed route will severely detract from our style of life and enjoyment of our remote house.</i>	Rejected: the proposed route is in the spirit of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 and outwith the curtilage of the house.

L: Tromie Bridge to Ruthven
Land Owner(s) RSPB, Billy & Andrew Cowan (Gordonhall Farm)
Land Manager(s) Carl Mitchell (RSPB)

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
No comment			
In favour	6a, 16f, 37f, 39g, 48g		
Not in favour: no alternative suggested	10a	<i>.. it cuts through fields which we use for rearing young bulls and the path would need to be fenced on both sides which would interfere with access to most of the farm for stock and machinery. Where it crosses the Burn of Ruthven the ground is very steep and can only be described as a gorge. I cannot see many people making such a detour when they are in sight of the Barracks</i>	Accepted: there is a need for further discussion regarding this part of the route.
Not in favour: alternative suggested	54f	Use the main road beside Ruthven Farm and connect with Barracks	Noted: this is a fall-back position.
Additional Comments	9a	Comments re line of route, H & S considerations, particularly with reference to cattle and gates, plus protection of botanically rich field.	(Met to discuss this. Minor alterations and accommodation works proposed and deemed acceptable.)

N: Ruthven to Newtonmore
Land Owner(s) Sustrans
Land Manager(s)

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
No comment			
In favour	6a, 16f, 37f, 39g,		
	11d	<i>Practically and pragmatically, although the final part of the route along the existing Sustrans Cycleway is not our preferred choice, we do accept that to make progress the entire route ... including the section between Kingussie and Newtonmore is an acceptable option and one that we support.</i>	Accepted: we realise that this is not the ideal route, but there are a number of points in its favour
	48g	<i>... the use of the Sustrans track from Kingussie to Newtonmore is the most direct route and as such, despite the fact that it is a tarred path by the road, is likely to appeal to long distance walkers coming to the end of the Speyside Way.</i>	Accepted: we realise that this is not the ideal route, but there are a number of points in its favour
Not in favour: no alternative suggested	43h	<i>.... Do not want to walk on roads or tarmac paths such as Sustrans....</i>	Managed: this will just be a small part of a much longer national route
	56c	<i>If Sustrans route is used, one large group of users will be excluded. (horse users)</i>	Noted: horse riders will not be excluded, although carriage driving is perhaps not appropriate for an LDR?

Not in favour: alternative suggested	15e	<i>The members Do not consider the 'preferred route' using the Sustrans Path suitable or desirable as part of a Long Distance Path, The Trust prefers the route using the road past Kingussie Golf Course, along the bank of Loch Gynack and through the hills to link up with the Wildcat Trail at Strone.</i>	Reflected: the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.
	20g	<i>Sustrans Cycle Route Not particularly interesting for walkers. We would like to see more investigation into an alternative route close to the Sustrans Path but above it on the north side North of Pitmain Farm and Ballachroan, coming down the Allt Laraidh as planned for option P</i>	Rejected: this was not considered in the initial investigation and although it does have some good points, the expense of building a completely new path only a short distance from an existing publicly funded route could probably not be justified.
	20g	<i>Failing that (see above) we would support option P via Loch Gynach</i>	Reflected: the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.

	25h	<p><i>... a semi-circular route from Kingussie to Newtonmore by way of the local Kingussie Walks, Pitmain Lodge, Loch Gynack Path, the Strone, Craggan, down into Newtonmore.</i></p> <p><i>.....would add some time But when the magnificent countryside etc. is taken into consideration the additional time would be of no consequence and will encourage first time visitors to come back again.</i></p>	<p>Reflected: the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.</p> <p>Comments re ‘magnificent countryside’ etc. noted, but not felt to be substantiated.</p>
	32h	<p><i>From Kingussie ... by Tom Baraidh by the newly marked path ... by path and track to Loch Gynack on the north side, then south from the track ,, to pick up a path on the south side of the trees to connect with the Wildcat Trail at Strone</i></p>	<p>Reflected: Slight variation may avoid golf course, however the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.</p>
	41h	<p><i>.... essential that there is a grand finale to the Speyside Way along the Gynack from Kingussie to Glen Gynack and the loch, then across the moors to link up with the Wildcat Trail and then down the Calder Gorge to Newtonmore</i></p>	<p>Reflected: the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.</p>
	42h	<p>From Kingussie to Loch Gynack, either via Golf Club or Tom Barradh, then track on NE side of Loch Connect with Strone Road...</p>	<p>Reflected: the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.</p>

	44h	<i>... a better routing would be to follow the North bank of the River Spey from Ruthven Bridge to meet up with the Wildcat Trail at the golf course</i>	Rejected: this option would be subject to an unacceptable likelihood of flooding
	44h	<i>.... Over (or around) Creag Bheag to the North of Kingussie to link up with the Wildcat Trail at Strone</i>	Reflected: the alternative suggested, while undoubtedly more attractive to walkers, will be very much more difficult to implement and will be difficult to construct to a standard for all users.
Additional comments	11d	<i>Once the Way is, in our terms, completed, we will most certainly want to explore how walking links can be made between east and west, through Glen Banchor to the Corrieyairack Pass, and potentially through by Loch Spey to Glen Roy and on to the West Highland Waythese Would be adjunctive to, and not part of the Speyside Way</i>	Noted: this is not pertinent to the current consultation
	12d	Concern expressed over the safety of walkers, cyclists and horseriders using the narrow bridge at the same time as road vehicles. Suggest a traffic lights vehicle control system	Noted
	32h	<i>(from Ruthven Barracks) pick up what is left of General Wade's road to cross the river by a new footbridge.....</i>	Noted, but not likely to be practical.
	38h	<i>... my most serious concern is the use of the road bridge across the Spey I accept that there is no alternative but ... it is not a safe option</i>	Noted

	42h	<i>... from the Barracks ... no real need to use the road Path to River Spey and a new footbridge.....</i>	Noted, but not likely to be practical.
	42h	<i>... Glen Banchor ... Cluny Castle... new path Laggan Bridge</i>	Noted
	44h	<i>... concerned that the proposed use of the Sustrans route May bring walkers into conflict with cyclists</i>	Rejected: under the new access legislation each will have to have regard for the other.
	56c	<i>As an alternative the Newtonmore Kingussie Folk Museum has talked about having a route linking both sites....</i>	Noted

General Points:

Comment	Respondent code	Suggestion	Recommendation and suggested action
	5b	<i>I think that the Speyside Way should, as its name suggests, follow as closely as possible to the River Spey</i>	Rejected: this is not one of the criteria for route selection
	14d	<i>Re Scotways response – given the public investment in the Badenoch Way the Speyside Way should make as much use of this route as possible. – the Development Company fully endorses the latter as we have responsibility for maintenance of the Badenoch Way and would be very happy for the CNPA to take over for those sections which you may adopt.</i>	Managed: consideration of the future maintenance of the Badenoch Way should be included in further discussion.
	16f	Evaluation: greater weight should be given to the sections that provide the best visitor experience as well as the greatest scope for multi-use.	Noted
	19g	<i>The British Horse Society (Scotland) would like to be involved, and to work with representative councils to give advice on surfacing and other aspects which would be kind to horse's legs, hard wearing and above all, safe</i>	Noted: BHS should be included in any discussion over path standards etc.
	19g	<i>According to some local riders the preferred route has accomplished the most useful multi-use path possible.</i>	Noted

	27f	Strong support for multi-use, but concerns that this may apply to sections only and leave people stranded. Alternatives need to be clearly spelt out.	Noted: multi-use alternatives need to be considered for those sections where multi-use is not practical
	27f	Concerned that environmental sensitivity should not be seen as being restrictive, but should rather be managed.	Noted: environmental sensitivity is only an issue when there is a danger that a criminal offence may be committed.
	27f	Supports the links to community path networks and would like to see links/ information to other outdoor facilities	Noted
	27f	Clarification required re nomenclature of sections of Badenoch Way which are used for Speyside Way	Noted

	28h	<p><i>There was a lack of visibility and openness in the gathering of evidence in respect of particular routes..... Very few people locally seem aware that the investigation or consultation had been going on. In the documents eventually sent ... the choice of route is presented as a fait accompli. Kinrara Estate has been going through a process of sale and transfer of ownership and it would be reasonable to review the consultation process to allow for this. (note that earlier discussions with the Estate suggested that E might be acceptable) While the alleged aim ... is to 'confirm support' for a particular route It seems that the serious lack of support for option E has been ignored... In view of the profound difficulties in the collection, evaluation, presentation and discussion of evidence in relation to various alternative routes and the obvious bias in favour of one particular route, I believe that any reasonable person would regard the consultation process so deeply flawed as to be unacceptable as a means for determining the case for any route. I therefore demand that this consultation be revised.....</i></p>	<p>Rejected: the consultee has misunderstood the purpose of consultation</p>
--	-----	---	--

	29f	<i>This particular proposal has additional merit in that it can target an existing market of long distance route walkers and increase their length of stay in the area</i>	Noted
	29f	<i>..our key aims in selecting an appropriate route would be that it should give the visitor a high quality experience while also taking them to local communities so as to spread the economic benefits The extension as proposed, by taking a route with extensive views while still passing through the main communities of Kincraig, Kingussie and Newtonmore would, in our view achieve both these aims...</i>	Noted
	35f	<i>At any locations where walkers are required to walk on the carriageway or verge of a public road, advance warning signs may be required and walkers in each direction should preferably be directed along one side of the road only. ... Similarly, warning signs may be necessary at any locations where the route crosses a trafficked public road, and it will be necessary to ensure that adequate forward visibility is provided and maintained at each approach to the crossing point.</i>	Managed: this will be considered as part of the implementation phase.

	48g	<i>.. we feel it would have been preferable for your Development Officer to have consulted us before completing his report.....</i>	Rejected: the consultation gives ample opportunity for airing views.
	48g	<i>A long distance route Should be something more than a collection of loosely linked local pathworks. ... experience suggests they will not want to make detours...</i>	Accepted in part: the LDR will be a national route: however, experience suggests that long distance walkers will adhere to the designated route
	48g	<i>The suggested line should concentrate on what is desirable..... but should not seek to anticipate landowner objections on 'traditional' grounds of not wanting to have anyone on their land.</i>	Reflected: route development will include thorough consultation with landowners to ensure that the 'desirable' meets the 'workable' as much as possible.
	48g	<i>....the pressures for multi-use should be much less on this route than on the many path networks which exist in this area. Touring cyclists are already well catered for.... Long distance horse riders are a very small minority. So the primary consideration on this section of the route should be to provide a quality experience for long distance, pack carrying, walkers</i>	Rejected: all types of user should be accommodated where possible. The new legislation gives additional rights of access to cyclists and horseriders and their needs should be catered for in any new proposals for access.
	49f	<i>The line of the preferred route would appear to be the best fit available based upon the evaluation criteria, quality of recreational experience, links to villages and land management regimes</i>	Noted