

CAIRNGORMS
NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
ÙGH DARRAS PÀIRC NÀISEANTA A'
MHON AIDH RUAIDH

Cairngorms Equality Advisory Panel

25th October 2022

5:00pm – 6:30pm - Held virtually

Minutes

Present

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| Anita Howard | Bo |
| Heather Earnshaw | Kevin Hutchens |
| Liliana Corrieri | Linda Bamford |
| Peter Kennedy | Stuart Hall |

Attending

| | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Colin Simpson | Fiona McInally |
| Fiona McLean (Chair) | Heather Trench |
| Jenny Allen | Kate Christie |
| Katherine Willing | |

Apologies

| | |
|-----------------|------------|
| Becca Mayo | Lina Payne |
| Vanessa Altweck | |

1. Welcome (17:00)

1.1. Fiona welcomed the group to the meeting.

2. Recap and Actions from previous Meeting on 30th August 2022

2.1. The actions from the previous meeting were reviewed and the minutes were agreed with some changes to be made prior to them being uploaded to the website. It was agreed the changes would be emailed to the equalities inbox.

3. Paper 1: Sustainable Tourism Action Plan Heather - Trench and Fiona McInally

3.1. Heather and Fiona introduced their paper and asked the panel to comment on the following questions:

- How can we work with business and communities to ensure we reach under-represented groups and identify improvements which will benefit our approach to sustainable tourism within the National Park?
 - How do we ensure that the National Park is as accessible as possible for those who are on lower incomes and that the opportunities available to enjoy the Park are appropriate for the widest possible range of visitors?
- 3.2. In response to how the speakers can work with businesses and communities to ensure that they reach under-represented groups and identify improvements which will benefit the approach to sustainable tourism within the National Park the panel suggested the following:
- The panel suggested that from previous meetings data surrounding tourists from ethnic minorities and the LGBT communities was low or not captured, therefore, it might be helpful to approach the equality councils in city areas who may be able to help identify the barriers.
 - The panel suggested that the speakers approach local businesses such as hostels, about introducing the LGBT Highland Marker.
 - The panel suggested involving organisations who support diverse groups.
- 3.3. In response to how the speakers could ensure the national park is accessible for those on lower incomes and that opportunities are available to the widest range of visitors the panel suggested the following:
- The panel suggested working with the Tom Hunter Foundation.
 - The panel suggested ensuring that not just the activity itself is low cost but other aspects such as the travel and equipment also need to be accessible. Without this the panel suggested visitors may be able to come to the park but they may not be able to participate in any activities.
 - The panel suggested that the speakers should consider working with the Family Holiday Charity formally known as the Family Holiday Association to help provide low-cost holidays and invite social care organisations to an event to find out how they can partner with benevolent associations.
 - The panel explained that asking visitors for donations may be off-putting for many visitors on low incomes and it would have to be thought about carefully as to how this was implemented.
 - The panel suggested that to encourage those from low-incomes to visit the park there needed to be resources on the CNPA website which are not currently in existence.
- 3.4. The panel also suggested that to ensure successful delivery there needed to be involvement from a diverse range of stakeholders who are responsible for specific action points. The panel explained that at present it is not clear who is doing what which means the plan lacks accountability.
- 3.5. The panel also suggested that the paper lacked considerations regarding retaining staff the impacts of Brexit, visas, and housing.

4. Paper 2: Infrastructure Plan - Colin Simpson

- 4.1. Colin gave an overview of the paper and reiterated that some of what is discussed will be mentioned in the NPPP and there is a hope not to repeat this too much.

Colin reminded the panel that this is not about day-to-day services, it is about investment in new activities.

4.2. Colin asked the group the following:

Overall Plan:

- How can we best ensure appropriate consideration of the opportunities to remove or minimise barriers to access? Is this about having strong underlying principles in the plan or is it better to look at site-specific recommendations as proposals are developed?
- Are the options for further exploration given in the draft text the most appropriate ones? Are there others we ought to include?

Individual site recommendations:

- Do you have any specific ideas around signposting of alternatives? For example, is it more appropriate at a car park that only gives access to very rough / challenging terrain to signpost alternatives for those with mobility difficulties rather than trying to improve the car park when the visitor may not be able to access anything beyond it?
- Do you know of similar projects where best practice has been achieved that we might use as examples to follow?

4.3. In response to how the speaker can best ensure appropriate consideration of the opportunities to remove or minimise barriers to access the panel suggested the following:

- The panel felt the plan was very person centred and focused. The panel suggested looking at the five principles from the Just transition Commission for Scotland (Advisory group) and sense check the paper against this.
- The panel felt it would be helpful to have access and buggy groups visit sites when discussing new infrastructure to ensure it is accessible and there are regular path inspections.
- The panel also felt it would be of benefit to have 'mystery shoppers' come to sites to see how they could interact with the infrastructure and what improvements could be made. Colin explained this could not be enforced but the plan could address how this could be encouraged.

4.4. In response to specific ideas around signposting of alternatives, the panel suggested the following:

- The panel felt the paper lacked information on interpretation, but this would need to be looked at on a site-by-site basis.
- The panel felt from personal experience, signposting what condition the paths are and some alternatives would be helpful to avoid disappointment. However, the panel did say its much better to provide information and then allow individuals make the decision.
- The panel also discussed how although accessibility it not binary it may be helpful to follow a path grading system however it was felt that there was not a suitable system nationwide system currently in place. The panel felt that there would still

need to be some narrative that accompanied any grading system to ensure that all information needed was given.

5. AOB

5.1. There were no AOBs raised.

Next Meeting 29th November 2022

END OF MEETING