

ANNEX 1

Outstanding Objections and Proposed Amendments to the Core Paths Plan

Those objections that we considered are unlikely to be withdrawn and are therefore likely to be the subject of a Local Inquiry are highlighted in **grey and bold**.

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
Water Access				
1	<p>Objection to the inclusion of LBS1, the River Spey, on the grounds of it not being required for the sufficiency of the network, the adverse economic impact on fishing interests and future investment, the increase in paddlers, the adverse impact on the designated site with consequential conflicts between paddlers and SNH, no plans in place to regulate the intensity of use to ensure responsible behaviour, safety concerns, reduction in privacy from commercial groups, a lack of adequate facilities for users leading to increased friction, the route can only be used in one direction and liability for any accidents will fall on CNPA.</p> <p><i>(Objection references 3/25, 3/26, 3/27, 3/29, 3/31, 3/37, 3/41, 3/70, 3/76 and 3/82)</i></p>	Reject	<p>The Spey is one of the most popular touring rivers in the UK and not including it would affect the overall sufficiency of the Plan. The inclusion of the river in the network has resulted from the level of support for it which has been received throughout the two year consultation process. Advice given by SNH indicates that there is unlikely to be an adverse impact on the environment and, as no additional promotion is envisaged by CNPA it is not clear how core path designation would lead to an increase in paddling. The Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 places a clear duty on those taking recreation and those managing land to act responsibly. The issue of privacy is clearly defined in law and to propose a form of regulation on paddlers would be counter to the new law. One of the three principles that the Scottish Outdoor Access Code is founded on is "To take responsibility for your own actions." This clearly places responsibility with the individual taking access and in relation to a fast flowing river the hazards are obvious. Core path designation can assist in the management of access by including valuable information at popular access and egress points. In addition there has been high levels of support for inclusion of the River Spey in the Core Paths Plan throughout the</p>	Local Inquiry

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
2	Objection to the inclusion of River Spey access and egress points LBS131, 136 and 137 on the grounds of impacting on the fishing interests and resulting in increased use of the river by inexperienced users <i>(Objection reference 3/70)</i>	Reject	The river access points at Grantown, Broomhill Bridge and Aviemore are the key access and egress points for the river in lower Strathspey. It will be the sympathetic management of these sites that will help manage different users on the river and ensure the Plan is sufficient for the needs of water users.	Local Inquiry
3	Objection to the inclusion of UDE63, a river access point at Dinnet Bridge on the grounds of privacy, risk to commercial fishing activities, parking, conservation and potential damage to the river bank. <i>(Objection references 3/1, 3/50, 3/57 and 3/64)</i>	Accept	This river access point is currently used by some local paddlers, however, the banks are quite steep and parking is limited. This has already caused parking issues in the area for both anglers, paddlers and a local resident. The Estate is unwilling to establish a car park as it may attract more people (including non-water users) to stop at the area. There is no through path and as such it would lead to people congregating on the bank at the Estate's main fishing hut which is located at this access point. The Estate has actively developed visitor information, car parking and access opportunities elsewhere on the Estate to manage people away from their commercial activities. Removal of this access point from the core paths network should not affect the overall sufficiency. Other access points to the river at the Linn of Dee, Braemar, Inver and Crathie are proposed core paths as well as the access point outwith the Park at Aboyne.	Objection withdrawn
Upland and Remote Paths				

N ^o .	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
4	<p>Objection to the inclusion of upland paths in the network on the grounds that such paths are expensive to maintain and may lead inexperienced walkers into dangerous areas with consequential impacts on rescue teams, there will be a loss of wildness by more people going into the mountains, increased pressure on bridges, more signposting and promotion through appearing on maps. <i>(Objection references 3/2, 3/47 and 3/71)</i></p>	Reject	<p>There is no requirement to upgrade paths in mountain areas and current policies on path management makes this clear. Similarly, way marking in such areas is contrary to policy in the Outdoor Access Strategy. To address both these issues, the Core Paths Plan will make greater cross reference to other plans and strategies. Core paths will not be promoted in their own right by CNPA. All of the upland paths that are proposed as core paths already feature in books and leaflets such as the Hill Tracks leaflet. All of these paths also have existing Scotways signposting at either end. The decision to include core paths on OS maps is regrettable but it is unlikely that those with no knowledge of the mountain environment will turn to an OS map as the first means of exploring the countryside. The paths selected in the upland areas are those that best fit with the objectives of the Plan. Removal of all/some of these paths from the Plan would have a material impact on the sufficiency of the network.</p>	Local Inquiry

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
5	<p>Objection that Glen Tromie, the Gaick Pass, the Minigaig, Mounth Road, Firmounth, Glen Avon, Clais Fhearnaig, Jock's Road are not included on the grounds that the routes are historic rights of way, are popular through routes and better link the mountain path network (<i>Objection references 3/18, 3/19, 3/60, 3/62, 3/63</i>)</p>	Modify	<p><u>Glen Tromie & Gaick</u> – The route from Strathspey to northern Perthshire through the Tromie and Gaick is popular and does provide an alternative to the busy A9 for walkers and mountain bikers. Its inclusion would also link to the network in Perth and Kinross. It is recommended that this route be added to the Core Paths Plan <u>Minigaig</u> – this route runs parallel to the Gaick but goes into a more remote area and is not as popular as the Gaick. Its inclusion would appear to be over provision. <u>Firmounth & Mounth</u> – There was some demand for both of these paths. On discussion with objectors and the Estate it was established that the Mounth Road over Mount Keen fits best with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan and it is therefore proposed that it be included in the network to ensure a link between Deeside and Glen Mark. <u>Clais Fhearnaig</u> - Only one objector has requested this path and there has been no demand for it in previous consultations. It does not fit well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan. In addition, NTS Mar Lodge has indicated that it does not fit well with their management plan for the area. Clais Fhearnaig will therefore not be proposed as a core path. <u>Glen Avon</u> - Only one objector has requested this path and there has been no demand for it in previous consultations. It does not fit well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan. Glen Avon will therefore not be proposed as a core path. <u>Jock's Road</u> - Only one objector has sought this route's inclusion and there has been little demand in previous consultations. Whilst the route from the south is easy to find and follow, it takes walkers into an area on high ground that is ill defined and the descent into Glen Callater is both steep and challenging. It is therefore not</p>	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
6	Requests small re-alignment of CC7, path from Corgarff to Inchroy, at Lagganald as per the Moray Council Public Path Diversion Order 2000. <i>(Objection references 3/13)</i>	Accept	It is proposed that this path be re-aligned to reflect the Public Path Diversion Order agreed by the Moray Council in 2000.	Objection withdrawn
7	Request for appropriate safety information to accompany upland path on the grounds of safety <i>(Objection references 3/15 and 3/39)</i>	Accept	Appropriate safety information can be included at popular setting off points and there will be a statement on the key to OS maps that core path status does not imply that they will always be safe to use.	Objection withdrawn
8	Requests inclusion of existing and new paths to create a link between Corgarff and Ballater. <i>(Objection references 3/48 and 3/55)</i>	Reject	There was little support for inclusion of this link in previous consultations. The proposed new section of path over Scraulac could not be achieved within the 2 year time frame and other sections of the route start and finish at remote points on a rural road. These links are an important part of the wider network but are remote from settlements and public transport connections, as such they do not fit well with the Core Paths Plan objectives. As such the route was not included in the Draft Plan and as a result the land manager has not been given the opportunity to comment formally. During informal discussion with the land manager, however, they are very against inclusion of the route in the core paths network at this time.	Local inquiry <i>(one objection withdrawn and one upheld)</i>
Eastern Cairngorms				

N ^o .	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
9	Requests inclusion of existing road to link Ballater and Glen Muick. (<i>Objection references 3/20, 3/63 and 3/66</i>)	Modify	It is proposed that the path linking the Loch Muick circular to the car park be included in the network as it fits well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan. The link from the car park along the road to Ballater has not been included as per the Board paper on 18 January 2008.	Objection withdrawn
Upper Deeside				
10	Requests that UDE62 and UDE25 are linked up at Crathie. (<i>Objection reference 3/63</i>)	Accept	It was the intention in the Draft Core Paths Plan that these two routes be linked to reflect what exists on the ground, however, a mapping error was made and will therefore be rectified.	Objection withdrawn
11	Requests inclusion of existing track between Crathie and Invercauld through Ballochbuie. (<i>Objection reference 3/63</i>)	Reject	This path has not been included as per the Board paper on 18 January 2008.	Objection withdrawn
12	Objection to inclusion of UDE34, Pannanich Hill due to potential disturbance to a Natura Meta-population. (<i>Objection reference 3/59</i>)	Accept	Advice from Forestry Commission Scotland and Scottish Natural Heritage has indicated that it would be inappropriate for the continued promotion of this path for natural heritage reasons. FCS is willing to investigate provision of an alternative route and therefore it is proposed that UDE34 be removed from the Plan.	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
13	Requests inclusion of a new all-abilities path in Ballater from Cinder Path along Pass of Ballater to link in with Deeside Way. <i>(Objection reference 3/81)</i>	Reject	Only one objector has requested this path although there has been some demand for similar proposals in previous consultations. An all-abilities route has recently been developed in Ballater and as such a new circular all-abilities path is not a resource priority at this time. The route also circumnavigates an area zoned for housing within the Local Plan and as such could be developed in conjunction with any future housing developments.	Objection withdrawn
14	Requests inclusion of new path to link up Ballater and the Sgor Buidhe path. <i>(Objection reference 3/63)</i>	Reject	This path appeared in the Interim Draft Core Paths Plan but was removed for conservation issues.	Objection withdrawn
15	Objection to inclusion of UDE59, linking Cambus O'May and Ballater on the south side of the Dee. <i>(Objection reference 3/12)</i>	Modify	It is proposed that the dashed line at the western end be extended for 300 metres and eastern end for 100 metres to reflect the fact that there is no path existing there at present. The dashed line should also be re-aligned further away from dwellings and around the edge of the fields to avoid privacy issues and to enable stock management.	Objection withdrawn
16	Requests extension of UDE40 along existing track between Cambus O'May and Boggerfool to link over towards Tarland. <i>(Objection reference 3/63)</i>	Accept	It is proposed that this path be included to enable the network to link up towards Tarland which fits well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan. During informal discussion with the land manager they have indicated that this proposal is acceptable.	Objection withdrawn
Upper Donside				

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
17	Objection to the inclusion of UDO10,11&12, all proposed core paths in the Ben Newe Woodlands area. (<i>Objection references 3/40, 3/42 & 3/46</i>)	Modify	The objector objected to all core paths in this area, however, their main concern relates to UDO12 the timber haul route. UDO12 provides a link between two other core paths, however, due to the distances and terrain involved it is unlikely to be an attractive or well used path. It is proposed to remove UDO12 from the network as it is unlikely to affect the sufficiency of the network and may enable the objector to remove objections to the other two paths.	Objection withdrawn
18	Requests inclusion of existing road between Bellabeg and Waterside on the south side of the Don in its entirety and the A944 linking Bellabeg and Roughpark. (<i>Objection reference 3/66</i>)	Modify	The quiet road linking Bellabeg to the new Bridge (UDO5) is already proposed as a core path. Inclusion of the rest of the road to link up to UDO13 at Waterside fits well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan. It is therefore proposed to include this road in the network. The A944 is a fast moving road with bad sight lines and as such off-road routes such as UDO3 are being developed. The A944 will therefore not be proposed as a core path.	Objection withdrawn
Glenlivet & Tomintoul				
19	Requests inclusion of path to link the network up to the proposed Glenfiddich core path within the Moray Council area. (<i>Objection references 3/16 & 3/49</i>)	Accept	It is proposed that an existing path linking GT2 and GT5 to the existing Glenfiddich Right of Way be included in the Plan. During informal discussion with the land manager they have indicated that this proposal is acceptable.	Objection withdrawn
Lower Badenoch & Strathspey				

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
20	Objection to the inclusion of a number of paths around Dulnain Bridge (LBS95, LBS96, LBS97, LBS100 & LBS101) on the grounds that they conflict with existing land management practices. <i>(Objection references 3/59 and 3/70)</i>	Modify/ Reject	It is proposed that LBS97 and the section of LBS101 from the Roche Moutonnées be removed from the Plan to address concerns regarding safety around farm traffic. LBS95, 96 and 100, however, have widespread community support and fit well with the Core Paths Plan objectives. It is therefore proposed that the objection to these three paths is rejected.	Local Inquiry
21	Requests the inclusion of an additional route from LBS93 in Curr Wood to Croft James and that LBS93 is extended down the slip road to the junction at Broomhill Bridge. <i>(Objection references 3/2 & 3/23)</i>	Reject	Continuing negotiations with the land owner and agents has demonstrated that LBS93 would be difficult to achieve within the two year timeframe. There has been little public support for the extension or additional route which poses a number of both safety and privacy issues. It is proposed that neither LBS93, the proposed extension or additional path are included within the Plan.	Objection withdrawn
22	Requests inclusion of a new route linking Boat of Garten and Street of Kincardine (as per LBS65 in the <i>Interim Draft</i> Core Paths Plan which was not included in the <i>Draft</i> Core Paths Plan),. A new route from Street of Kincardine to Tulloch Moor and a new route linking Loch Vaa to Boat of Garten. <i>(Objection references 3/5, 3/42, 3/68, 3/77 & 3/79)</i>	Reject	LBS65 was omitted from the Draft Core Paths Plan on the grounds that it would be difficult to achieve within 2 years. This is because new sections would have to be developed which would impact on existing farmland and further sections would require substantial upgrading to cross wet areas. In discussions with one of the land owners it is apparent that they would be against the inclusion of the route on their ground at this time due to safety concerns. The proposed new route to Tulloch Moor and Loch Vaa would have an impact on the natural heritage and as such would not be in line with current Core Paths Plan objectives.	Local Inquiry

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
23	Objects to the inclusion of LBS71 linking Boat of Garten with Drumuillie as it raises concerns of increase use which would lead to conflict between users and existing farming practices. <i>(Objection reference 3/70)</i>	Reject	Throughout the development of the Draft Core Paths Plan there has been continued support for this route as it provides an important link between communities and fits well with the Plan objectives	Local Inquiry
24	Objects to the inclusion of LBS112 at Loch Garten due to concerns that further promotion would diminish the quality of the experience for existing users and that informal paths may branch out in to sensitive sites affecting Capercaillie. <i>(Objection reference 3/67)</i>	Reject	This existing promoted path fits well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan. It links the Boat of Garten community with an important recreation site and visitor attraction enabling people to enjoy the special qualities of the National Park.	Local Inquiry
25	Objects to the inclusion of LBS110 at Invershie House in Kincaig on the grounds that it interferes with existing land management practices. <i>(Objection reference 3/76)</i>	Accept	This path passes through the main stock holding area for the estate who state that gates are often left open resulting in livestock escaping. The land owner is content with the current level of use on this right of way and has proactively worked to help develop other alternatives including the nearby Badenoch Way. As such they would not accept further promotion of the route, particularly as the Speyside Way Extension is also proposed nearby.	Objection withdrawn
26	Objects to the inclusion of LBS128 in Kincaig pending the outcome of planning permission <i>(Objection reference 3/52)</i>	Modify	Developers and staff have agreed an alternative which will be accepted if the planning permission is granted for a house	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
27	Requests the inclusion of the Badenoch Way from Kincaig and amendments to Badenoch Way as well as other routes in Kincaig. Requests an additional route to Feshiebridge and Lagganlia. <i>(Objection reference 3/9)</i>	Modify	The Badenoch Way fits well with the objectives of the Core Paths Plan and its inclusion would address objections raised on adjoining paths. It is proposed to reject the request for a further route linking Feshiebridge and Lagganlia with Kincaig as there was little public demand and its inclusion could be classed as over sufficiency.	Objection withdrawn
28	Requests further additions to the Nethybridge network in the form of an extension to LBS92, LBS89 and a link route between Nethybridge and Dorback Lodge. <i>(Objection reference 3/21, 3/66)</i>	Modify	It is proposed that a new section of path is included that links LBS92 with the golf course club house, this popular path fits well with the Core Paths Plan objectives linking places of local importance. LBS89 currently incorporates a section of the Wilderness Trail and it is proposed that the whole of this promoted route is included as it fits well with the Plan objectives and provides a link to a local heritage site. Both objectors put forward the case for linking up Nethybridge with GT22 at Dorback Lodge, it is proposed that the public road from Nethy Bridge to Dorback is included in the Plan.	Objection withdrawn
29	Requests re-alignment of LBS127 through Abernethy to follow the existing Right of Way. <i>(Objection reference 3/67)</i>	Accept	The proposed change will not affect the sufficiency of the Plan.	Objection withdrawn
30	Objects to the inclusion of a section of LBS87 through an area zoned for housing. Their grounds include over sufficiency and potential limitation on site design and layout. <i>(Objection reference 3/70)</i>	Accept	This change will not affect the sufficiency of the Plan as an existing promoted route passes close by and provides a better option for existing and potential users.	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
31	Requests that LBS30 be extended through the Aviemore Highland Resort as per proposals in the <i>Interim Draft Core Paths Plan</i> . (<i>Objection reference 3/28</i>)	Modify	This path was dropped from the Draft Core Paths Plan because much of the AHR site was being redeveloped. It was decided that merely designating the existing pavements did not add to the sufficiency of the plan and that more creative solutions for access be pursued through planning. A strong case was made, however, to include the section past the pond at the southern end of AHR onto the Craigellachie National Nature Reserve. It is proposed that this access track be included in the Plan as it fits well with the Plan objectives and improves access to the NNR.	Objection withdrawn
32	Objects to the following paths in Aviemore LBS124, 35, 33, 34, 0 on the grounds of over sufficiency, safety around the golf course, impacts on livestock management and appropriateness in quite wooded areas. (<i>Objection reference 3/70</i>)	Modify	Removal of all of these paths would significantly compromise the sufficiency of the Plan around Aviemore. It is therefore proposed to reject all of the objections with the exception of LBS33. This path should be amended to reflect the route that exists on the ground which will satisfy the objector in that instance.	Local Inquiry
33	Requests that the routes in Carr-Bridge are amended to follow the path on the ground and that the on-road section of the Sustrans into the village centre is included. (<i>Objection references 3/22 and 3/66</i>)	Accept	LBS123 is a popular path which provides access across the golf course and into the woods north of Carr-Bridge, the current Plan has incorrectly marked this route and it is accepted that this route be changed. The Sustrans NCN7 route is shown on either side of the settlement and the case is made that the route is designated through the community, this fits well with the Plan objectives	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
34	Requests that the existing minor road between Carr-Bridge and Dulnain Bridge be designated as a core path for cyclists. <i>(Objection reference 3/66)</i>	Reject	There has been little support for this route throughout the consultation process and it does not fit well with the Plan objectives	Local Inquiry
35	It is requested that a number of new routes in Kingussie are designated linking the community with Tromie Bridge, Lynchat and Tombaraidh Wood. <i>(Objection reference 3/34)</i>	Modify	It is proposed that the path between the community and Tombaraidh Woods be included in the Plan as it fits well with the Plan objectives. The desire to link Tromie Bridge with Kingussie is being met through addressing other objections on upland paths. Lack of public support and land owner involvement rules out the Lynchat proposal.	Objection withdrawn
36	Objection to LBS3 in Cromdale on the grounds of privacy and interference with existing forestry management. <i>(Objection references 3/64 and 3/74)</i>	Accept	It is proposed that this path be removed from the Plan. It passes through the sight lines of the property and increased use could be seen as an infringement of privacy. Although the route is currently used by some in the community there was no public demand expressed for it.	Objection withdrawn
37	Objection to LBS4 along the riverbank between Grantown ad Cromdale on the grounds of potential impacts on fishing interests and a lack of community links. <i>(Objection reference 3/70)</i>	Accept	This route although reasonably popular does not add to the sufficiency of the Plan. Other more appropriate and accessible routes are near by which better meet the objectives of the Plan.	Objection withdrawn
38	Requests that LBS6 from the Interim Draft Core Paths Plan be reinstated <i>(Objection reference 3/23)</i>	Reject	It would be difficult to achieve this route in the two year time frame as it would require either a trunk road solution or sections of existing livestock pasture to be given over to a new path.	Objection withdrawn
Upper Badenoch & Strathspey				

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
39	Objection to the inclusion of UBS20, as it would not satisfy the needs of a variety of users, and UBS22 as it would potentially lead to conflict and safety issues between users. <i>(Objection reference 3/59)</i>	Modify	It is proposed that UBS20 be replaced with an existing forestry track and a new link down to UBS19. This solution was proposed by the land manager. It is proposed that UBS22 is reduced to the link between Strathmashie and the Dunn. This should address concerns the concerns of the land managers without impacting on the sufficiency of the network.	Objection withdrawn
Glenmore & Rothiemurchus				
40	Objection to lack of inclusion of Thieves road from Loch Gamhna to Inshriach. <i>(Objection reference 3/39)</i>	Reject	The Aviemore to Kincaig link will best be served by the Speyside Way extension on the north side of the Spey. When consulting on potential routes for the Speyside Way extension, advice from SNH pointed to some particularly sensitive features on this route.	Local Inquiry
41	Objection to inclusion of GR1, GR2, GR3, GR4, GR5 and CC3 on the grounds that there is a lack of clarity on how CNPA will assist land managers integrate access with land management operations. Environmental issues have not been adequately addressed in the plan. <i>(Objection reference 3/78)</i>	Reject	The objector has indicated that the objection would be removed if there was a long term commitment to maintain all the paths from the Park Authority or another funding source. There is no requirement on the part of CNPA to maintain the route. The SEA did not flag up any adverse impacts as a result of core path designation as all the routes are currently promoted.	Local Inquiry

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
42	Objection to lack of extension of GR7 to the summit of Craiggowrie and a desire to see GR6 re-routed to go past Badaguish <i>(Objection reference 3/32)</i>	Reject	GR7, by reaching the summit of Meall à Bhuachaille, already provides a link to the wider path network and a further extension is viewed as over provision. The Craiggowrie path appeared in the <i>Interim Draft Core Paths Plan</i> , however, it was removed when consultation raised environmental sensitivities on the descent from Craiggowrie to the Slugan. GR6 is the right of way and the most popular of the tracks through this section of forest. The diversion, based solely on commercial grounds, is not supported.	Local Inquiry
43	Objection to the lack of path linking Coire Cas and Coire na Ciste car parks <i>(Objection reference 3/30)</i>	Reject	Only one objector has requested this path and there has been no demand for it in previous consultations. Whilst the proposed route would provide impressive views and provide opportunities for cultural and natural interpretation, it is not regarded as necessary to ensure the plan is sufficient.	Objection withdrawn
General Issues				
44	Raises concern that there is no clarity over maintenance of core paths. <i>(Objection reference 3/39)</i>	Reject	Page 14 of the Draft Core Paths Plan clearly states how a partnership approach will be required to maintain the core paths network.	Objection withdrawn
45	Requests Core Paths Plan overview map (Map 1) to show core paths in the context of the public transport network. <i>(Objection reference 3/66)</i>	Reject	The overview map of the core paths network is of a large scale and showing more than just the core paths network and roads network on it is challenging. It is proposed, however, that railway stations also be shown on the map to show key linkages. On smaller scale maps of each area, the Ordnance Survey maps on which the core paths network is overlaid, display railway lines.	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
46	Objects to the inclusion of all paths in upland and sensitive areas as they believe that their appearance on 1:25,000 Ordnance Survey mapping will lead to unacceptable levels of promotion in these areas. (<i>Objection reference 3/67</i>)	Reject	The core paths network must provide for reasonable access throughout the National Park, much of which is upland or designated for its natural heritage. As such core paths have only been proposed in upland and sensitive areas where: they already exist, already receive some level of promotion and signage and; can assist in managing access in the area. The SEA process and Appropriate Assessment for Natura has not identified any potential negative impacts from core path designation in these areas.	Local Inquiry
47	Requests that the Core Paths Plan identifies specific proposals for improving safety of on-road section of the network. (<i>Objection reference 3/24</i>)	Modify	Roads have only been included in the Core Paths Plan where it is an important link in the network and are already well used by walkers and cyclists. Staff have been in discussion with the four Roads Authorities that cover the Park area and they have not objected to any of the proposed paths on roads. Negotiation over specific proposals to limit speeds will be undertaken once we have the Plan adopted. The roads departments recognise that the core paths proposed on roads are already well used by walkers and cyclists and as such steps need to be taken to make them safer for these users. It is proposed that further text be included within the Final Core Paths Plan to explain this further.	Objection withdrawn
48	Objects to lack of definition in the Plan of what is 'reasonable access'. (<i>Objection reference 3/80</i>)	Accept	It is proposed to include further text in the Plan to better explain how 'reasonable access' is defined in terms of the aim, objectives and consultation process.	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
49	Objects to lack of information on provision for different user types within the Plan. (<i>Objection reference 3/80</i>)	Modify	It is proposed to include further text in the Plan to better explain how different users are catered for by the Plan and the reasons for lack of specific information about use types on each path.	Objection withdrawn
50	Objects to lack of definition of what is 'high quality' raising concern that all core paths will be heavily engineered. (<i>Objection reference 3/80</i>)	Modify	It is proposed to include further text in the Plan to better explain what is meant by 'high quality' i.e. does not mean that all paths must be engineered to a specific standard. It is also proposed to identify in the Plan which paths are considered to be in 'upland areas' and therefore subject to the relevant policies on way-marking and signage within the Outdoor Access Strategy.	Objection withdrawn
51	Objects to the assumption in the Plan that paths can only be 'upgraded'. Would wish to see that some paths be downgraded e.g. the work done on Mar Lodge Estate by NTS. (<i>Objection reference 3/80</i>)	Accept	It is proposed to include alternative text in Section 3.3 of the Plan to refer to 'appropriate works' rather than just upgrading or construction.	Objection withdrawn
52	Objects to the lack of clarity over how/when a core path might be closed/removed/diverted. (<i>Objection reference 3/80</i>)	Accept	It is proposed to include further text in the Plan to explain the process required for removal or re-alignment of a core path.	Objection withdrawn
53	Objects to the lack of match with Local Plan in relation to wild land areas. (<i>Objection reference 3/80</i>)	Accept	It is proposed to include further text in the Plan to explain how wild land qualities have been taken into account whilst developing the Core Paths Plan.	Objection withdrawn

No.	Objection summary	Accept/ Reject/ Modify	Reason	Possible Implication
54	Objects to the Plan on the grounds that there are too many paths and that it would be impossible to develop them all to a set standard. (<i>Objection reference3/58</i>)	Reject	Core paths will not be developed to a set standard. It can be of any standard as long as it meets the community need and Plan objectives. Development will always be based on a range of factors including community priorities and land management and that maintenance will be a creative solution using existing funding measures and commitments.	Objection withdrawn
55	Requests that the Sustrans NCN7 route as it passes through the Park is designated as a core path and labelled as the NCN7 in its entirety. (<i>Objection reference3/66</i>)	Modify	NCN7 is proposed as a core path through Carr-Bridge, Aviemore, Kingussie and Newtonmore. Designation of the route in its entirety, however, would include a large section of public road between Aviemore and Kingussie along the B970. There has been a presumption against inclusion of large sections of public road elsewhere in the Plan on grounds of safety and possible over sufficiency. It is therefore proposed that this section of NCN7 is not included in the Plan. Sections of the NCN7 are shared with other routes e.g. the Speyside Way and as such presents a 'labelling' problem which can be addressed in the final Plan.	Local inquiry