

From: automailer@cairnngorms.co.uk
Sent: 29 June 2008 12:35
To: Core Path Planning
Subject: Core Paths Planning Comments

Name: Mr Jack Hunt

Address: Sustrans, 20 Union Street, Edinburgh

Postcode: EH1 3LR

Email: jack.hunt@sustrans.org.uk

Phone: 07712-129-614

Responding on behalf of: Sustrans Scotland

1. Do you think that the proposed core paths network is sufficient to give people reasonable access throughout the area? No
2. Please state clearly and fully the grounds of your objection or support to the Draft Core Paths Plan: Map 1 – For Core Paths 'to give reasonable access through the area', they need to be shown to be integrated with the transport network. The roads on this map are unclear and disjointed. Railways are completely absent. This single and important overall map fails to give any essential transport context.

Map 1 – This overall map should also be used to show the context of long distance routes in their entirety, (eg. Speyside Way, Sustrans Route 7, Dava Way, Badenoch Way, Deeside Way, River Spey)

Map 3 – EC1, 3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11 and 15 provide a key north/south link across between glens. However EC8 appears to end short of the public road. It is essential that EC8 it links with it and preferably down Glen Muick to paths around Ballater.

Maps 3 + 4 – Going by precedents elsewhere in the Plan, there is no good reason why the Glen Muick public quiet rural road is not be marked as CP to link with the Ballater network, and hence help afford reasonable access.

Map 12 – To provide reasonable access in Strathdon; the quiet public road should be marked as a CP linking UD06 with UD013 and the A944 linking UD010, 01, 03 and 09 should be marked as a CP or proposed.

Maps 13 + 16 – To provide reasonable access, GT22 requires to run from Tomintoul to the public road east of Sliemore, not ending at Dorback Lodge (unless the Dorback Lodge road is in fact public).

Map 18 – The annotation which describes future linkage of LBS102 with LBS134, as shown on Map 17, should also be included on Map 18, since it's purpose is to link communities.

Maps 18 + 19 – Going by precedents elsewhere in the Plan, there is no good reason why the Carrbridge to Balnaan public quiet rural road is not be marked as CP to link two communities and hence help afford reasonable access.

Map 21 – Since Sustrans Route 7 is now finally aligned along LBS30 and LBS116, the 'demoted' LBS31 should be no longer be labelled as 'cycle path'.

Map 25 – UBS9 is shown, but is not entered in the table on page 41.

3. If objecting, please indicate what change(s) you are seeking to the Draft Core Paths Plan which could resolve your objection:
Sustrans (National) Route 7

Only traffic free and quiet roads sections of this long distance route are shown on the maps and included as CPs. OS base map symbols for it are present on some maps but not others. Continuity of sections of Route 7 as a Core Path is not maintained through settlements.

The Speyside Way is marked not only in its' entirety, also continuously through settlements and also with one consistent CP number throughout the Park. Hence it is inconsistent for Sustrans Route 7, not to be marked in its' entirety, through settlements and not to be given a single CP number.

Indeed in the busy Aviemore 'national resort' area (Map 21), the long distance, strategic and national context offered by it, is totally consumed by 3 local path names and Speyside Way.

This peculiar understatement of national recreational infrastructure provided at public cost is a considerable loss to the CNPA-CPP and contrasts sharply with the Loch Lomond & Trossachs National Park CPP, where both the West Highland Way and Sustrans Route 7 are both shown as CPs in their entirety, including where either of them runs on quiet public roads, and through settlements, and also where they run coincident.

Cairngorms National Park Authority

The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or organisation specified above. Any unauthorised dissemination or copying of this e-mail, or mis-use or wrongful disclosure of information contained in it, is strictly prohibited and may be illegal. Please notify the sender by return e-mail should you have received this e-mail in error.

Virus Warning: Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free from viruses, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus free. No responsibility is accepted by the Cairngorms National Park Authority for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt or opening

Spam. This e-mail has been scanned for Spam. However if you feel that this is Spam please forward this to mailmanager@cairngorms.co.uk

From: automailer@cairngorms.co.uk
Sent: 27 June 2008 17:24
To: Core Path Planning
Subject: Core Paths Planning Comments

Name: Mr Jeremy Roberts

Address: RSPB Abernethy National Nature Reserve

Forest Lodge

Nethybridge

Inverness-shire

Postcode: PH25 3EF

Email: jeremy.roberts@rspb.org.uk

Phone:

Responding on behalf of: RSPB, Abernethy National Nature Reserve

1. Do you think that the proposed core paths network is sufficient to give people reasonable access throughout the area? Yes
2. Please state clearly and fully the grounds of your objection or support to the Draft Core Paths Plan: We have concerns about some routes (below) but some generic concerns too.

Generic points:

1. We understand there are plans to add core paths to 1:25,000 maps. This will result in very significant promotion of specific routes within the Cairngorms National Park, and we are concerned that a NNR, as sensitive as Abernethy, is unable to sustain this level of promotion.
2. The sensitivity of capercaillie to disturbance is an issue the CNPA is helping to review in the coming weeks. Until this review is complete, I would have concerns about any routes through Abernethy Forest being promoted on a 1:25,000 map.
3. We are experiencing unacceptable lack of SOAC compliance from dog-walkers, who are
 - a) Not keeping dogs under close control or on a lead during the breeding season;
 - b) Failing to clear up after their dogs, resulting in school groups doing activities along the Mallachie trail encountering dog waste on a regular basis.

We have concerns that dog-walkers will be encouraged to use core paths, and will continue to do so inappropriately.

In addition to these generic concerns, our main concerns with individual routes are:

ROUTE LBS112 - is already a heavily-used and popular route. Further promotion could diminish the quiet enjoyment of current users. We are also concerned that folk will forge a link through to LB121, which passes through an area of growing importance for capercaillie. We are also concerned about increasing use of these routes by cyclists who are damaging the path surface - we have just had to effect £3k - worth of repair on this section, with no grant aid.

LBS112 section to Mallachie car park -

...If this is on N side of the road, it's a dedicated route to the Osprey centre. There is no formal crossing point to mallachie car park owing to safety concerns (bend in road, on a rise, at a junction/exit, on a narrow road) - which is why we haven't made this connection.

...If this is on the S side of the road, this route has grown over, and we have no plans to reinstate it substantially.

LBS127: We are concerned that this route, along the Dell Road, and the Scottish Right of Way that lies to the west (up Thompson's Brae and close to Lyngarrie), will result in two designated (possibly promoted) routes through this very important section of the forest. One route passes very close to a capercaillie lek; another through important brood-rearing habitat.

We have no concerns about any of the other routes outlined in the core path proposals.

3. If objecting, please indicate what change(s) you are seeking to the Draft Core Paths Plan which could resolve your objection: We would like to discuss the generic concerns outlined above, particularly with respect to the routes being shown on 1:25,000 maps, and the concern about disturbance to capercaillie in the forest.

LBS112: We do not wish to see this established as a core path.

LBS127: We do not wish to see this route designated as a core path, and - subject to the generic concerns above being addressed, would propose the Scottish Right of Way that lies to the west (up Thompson's Brae and close to Lyngarrie) as an alternative

Cairngorms National Park Authority

The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or organisation specified above. Any unauthorised dissemination or copying of this e-mail, or mis-use or wrongful disclosure of information contained in it, is strictly prohibited and may be illegal. Please notify the sender by return e-mail should you have received this e-mail in error.

Virus Warning: Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free from viruses, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus free. No responsibility is accepted by the Cairngorms National Park Authority for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt or opening

Spam. This e-mail has been scanned for Spam. However if you feel that this is Spam please forward this to mailmanager@cairngorms.co.uk

From: Iain/Sue Murray [iain.murray@onetel.net]

Sent: 28 June 2008 12:48

To: Core Path Planning

Subject: Boat of Garten

Dear Sir

I have two comments to make on the Core Paths plan and hope I am in time to submit these.

1) I think that a path to Loch Vaa should be included. The recognised walk is to go along kinchurdy rd as far as "The Yard" and turn right along the Forestry track and eventually turn left down to the Loch Vaa Boathouse. The ideal situation would be to create a path from where that track meets the main Aviemore to Kinveachy road to the Kinveachy junction whence there is already a path to Boat of Garten. That would make a lovely circular walk. People run and cycle it now but the part along the main road is dangerous, as there is not a path just now.

2) The short track at Street of Kincardine towards the Spey is a nonsense, as it does not lead anywhere. One used to be able to walk along the Spey but that is now discouraged by an unfriendly landowner. It would be good to have the Spey path reinstated.

Yours faithfully

Susan Murray

Drumuillie Mill

Boat of Garten

PH24 3BG

Cairngorms National Park Authority The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or organisation specified above. Any unauthorised dissemination or copying of this e-mail, or mis-use or wrongful disclosure of information contained in it, is strictly prohibited and may be illegal. Please notify the sender by return e-mail should you have received this e-mail in error. Virus Warning: Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free from viruses, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus free. No responsibility is accepted by the Cairngorms National Park Authority for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt or opening Spam. This e-mail has been scanned for Spam. However if you feel that this is Spam please forward this to mailmanager@cairngorms.co.uk



We safeguard the nation's historic environment and promote its understanding and enjoyment

Mr Adam Streeter-Smith
Outdoor Access Officer
Cairngorms National Park
14 The Square
Grantown-on-Spey
Moray
PH26 3HG

Development Assessment Team
Room E3
Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

Direct Line: 0131 668 8984
Direct Fax: 0131 668 8765
Switchboard: 0131 668 8600
HS.DAT@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Our ref: AMA/50/NB
Your ref:
26 June 2008



Dear Mr Streeter-Smith

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK CORE PATHS PLAN DRAFT AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

Thank you for consulting Historic Scotland (HS) on the draft Core Paths Plan and the accompanying Environmental Report.

We welcome the preparation of this draft plan and, for the avoidance of doubt, this response provides our comments on the draft plan and on the Environmental Report (ER). We have used the information included in the ER to help our review of the draft plan, and accordingly have combined our comments into a single response.

Our review of the ER is undertaken in our capacity as a Consultation Authority under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005.

Attached you will find two Annexes. Annex A contains a table detailing HS's comments on specific paths and comments on the ER. Annex B details HS's recommendations for an appropriate consideration of the historic environment in the selection and development of core paths.

Draft Core Paths Plan

We welcome the preparation of this draft plan and have considered it from our national historic environment perspective. The proposed extension of the core path network in the Cairngorms National Park and the opportunities it will bring for greater public accessibility to, and promotion of, cultural heritage sites in the area is also welcome. In this regard, the proposed core paths should contribute to the positive management and stewardship of these sensitive sites.

Our comments on this draft plan are set against that general background and the wider context of policy within the relevant Cairngorms National Park Local Plan and national planning policy as detailed in the attached Annex B. As noted above these comments concentrate on national issues. If you have not already done so, we recommend that you seek information from the relevant Council Archaeology and Conservation Services on the likely impacts of the proposed core paths on regional and local issues.

The Environmental Report

We are content that the comments we provided on the scoping report in 29 August 2006 have been taken account in the preparation of the ER. We have the following comments to offer on the proposals for monitoring identified in section 10.2. We note Cairngorms National Park Authority's (CNPA) approach to monitoring, and are content with this approach on the basis that CNPA includes a clear mechanism for monitoring and reporting on the SEA Objectives for the historic environment identified in Figure 10.1.

I hope the comments in this letter have been helpful to you. If you require clarification on any of the issues raised, please contact Adele Shaw at this address on 0131 667 8758 or adele.shaw@scotland.qsi.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely



MIRIAM McIVER
Team Administrator

Annex A

Cairngorms National Park Authority DRAFT CORE PATHS PLAN					
Core Paths Plan				Environmental Report	
Map Number and Area	Path Number(s)	Potential Impact(s)	Comments	Proposed Mitigation	Monitoring
Map 2 <i>Central Cairngorms</i> (Action Area A)	CC1	Mar, townships, enclosures, stills, kilns, Dubrach to E of Dalvorar (Index No. 6455)	Refer to Annex B Section 3.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 2 <i>Central Cairngorms</i> (Action Area A)	CC1 & CC2	Mar, shielings, enclosures & buildings, Bynack Lodge to Rugh nan Clach (Index No. 6453)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 2 <i>Central Cairngorms</i> (Action Area A)	CC4	Derry Burn, shielings 1150m SE of to 1700m SE of Lochan Uaine (Index No. 7695)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 2 <i>Central Cairngorms</i> (Action Area A)	CC5	Lui Water, townships 800m to 2780m SE of Derry Lodge (Index No. 7696)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 2 <i>Central Cairngorms</i> (Action Area A)	CC6	Invercauld Gardens & Designed Landscape	Refer to Annex B Section 3.4	Agreed	Agreed



Map Number and Area	Path Number(s)	Potential Impact(s)	Comments	Proposed Mitigation	Monitoring
Map 3 <i>Eastern Cairngorms</i> (Action Area A)	EC14	Invermark Castle (Index No. 2462) Category A Listed (HB Num. 11349)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1, 3.3, 4.1 and 4.3	Agreed	Agreed
Map 5 <i>Linn of Dee</i> (Action Area A)	UDE56	Allanquoich, mills 350m to 450m SW of (Index No. 7698)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 6 <i>Braemar</i> (Action Area C)	UDE15, UDE16, UDE20, UDE21, UDE22 UDE23	Invercauld Gardens & Designed Landscape	Refer to Annex B Section 3.4	Agreed	Agreed
Map 7 <i>Crathie</i> (Action Area C)	UDE26	Crathie Suspension Bridge Category A Listed (HB Num. 2988)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.3 and 4.3	Agreed	Agreed
Map 8 <i>Glen Tanar</i> (Action Area B)	UDE4, UDE47, UDE48 UDE50	Glen Tanar Gardens & Designed Landscape	Refer to Annex B Section 3.4	Agreed	Agreed
Map 12 <i>Strathdon</i> (Action Area D)	UDO1	Doone of Invernochty, motte (Index No. 94)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 13 <i>Glenlivet and Tomintoul</i> (Action Area E)	GT16	Ironstone Mine, mine & surface workings 800m NNE of the Lecht (Index No. 5945)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 16 <i>Lower Badenoch and Strathspey</i> (Action Area F)	LBS1 LBS72	i) Kinrara Gardens & Designed Landscape ii) Doone of Rothiemurchus Gardens & Designed Landscape	Refer to Annex B Section 3.4	Agreed	Agreed



Map Number and Area	Path Number(s)	Potential Impact(s)	Comments	Proposed Mitigation	Monitoring
Map 16 <i>Lower Badenoch and Strathspey</i> (Action Area F)	LBS114	Sluggan Bridge, bridge, Carrbridge (Index No. 961)	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed:
Map 17 <i>Grantown-on-Spey and Cromdale</i> (Action Area F)	LBS5	i) Castle Grant, East Lodge, Railway Bridge over A939 road and entrance arch to drive Category A Listed (HB Num. 349) ii) Castle Grant Gardens & Designed Landscape	Refer to Annex B Sections 3.3, 3.4 and 4.3	Agreed	Agreed
Map 17 <i>Grantown-on-Spey and Cromdale</i> (Action Area F)	LBS116	Old Spey Bridge Category A Listed (HB Num. 335)	Refer to Annex B Section 3.3 and 4.3	Agreed	Agreed
Map 18 <i>Dulnain Bridge and Nethy Bridge</i> (Action Area F)	LBS1	Broomhill Bridge Category A Listed (HB Num. 260)	Refer to Annex B Section 3.3 and 4.3	Agreed	Agreed
Map 19 <i>Carr-Bridge</i> (Action Area F)	LBS61	Carrbridge, old packhorse bridge (Index No. 960)	Refer to Annex B Section 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed

Map Number and Area	Path Number(s)	Potential Impact(s)	Comments	Proposed Mitigation	Monitoring
Map 26 <i>Laggan</i> (Action Area G)	UBS22	Dun-da-Lamh, fort (Index No. 4361)	Refer to Annex B Section 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 28 <i>Glenmore and Rothiemurchus</i> (Action Area H)	GR1	Balvattan, settlement and field system, Rothiemurchus (Index No. 9338)	Refer to Annex B Section 3.1 and 4.1	Agreed	Agreed
Map 28 <i>Glenmore and Rothiemurchus</i> (Action Area H)	GR1, GR4 & GR5	Doune of Rothiemurchus Gardens and Designed Landscape	Refer to Annex B Section 3.4	Agreed	Agreed

Annex B

1. General considerations

Impacts on historic environment features often depend on the land-take associated with infrastructure and supporting activities, and may be avoided through appropriate locational measures. Impacts on the historic environment should be considered in terms of the following:

- Direct i.e. loss and or damage to a feature of the historic environment
- Indirect i.e. effects on setting; changes to surface drainage patterns; removal of peat; etc.
- Any works to maintain/upgrade paths which cross listed structures such as bridges may require Listed Building Consent (LBC)
- Any works to maintain/upgrade paths or insert sign posts within a scheduled area will require scheduled monument consent (SMC) – see SHEP 2
- Sign posts erected in the vicinity of scheduled monuments or listed buildings should be located in a position which does not impact upon the setting of the monument or listed building. These works may need consent under the GDPO.
- Additionally, Historic Scotland should be consulted on any works to create/maintain/upgrade paths where they fall within the boundary of a garden or designed landscape included in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland.

2. Policy

The sensitivity of such sites and the historic environment as a whole should be taken into account in any assessment of environmental impacts associated with the creation and maintenance of core paths. Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 1 explains what we mean by the term “historic environment”. It sets out Scottish Ministers’ vision for the future of the historic environment, the key principles and policies which apply, and the role of HS and others in delivering this vision. Other documents in the SHEP series provide more details on the specific policies which apply to particular aspects of the historic environment. These documents can all be found on Historic Scotland’s website at www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage/policy/sheps.htm.

3. Impacts on Designated Sites

3.1. Scheduled Monuments: Numerous proposed core paths are existing paths which cross or are in close proximity to scheduled ancient monuments. Where new paths are proposed in the vicinity of scheduled areas we strongly advise that they are re-routed to avoid all such direct impacts. Any works proposed to create new or improve existing paths through the legally protected area of a scheduled monument would require the prior written consent of Scottish Ministers (scheduled monument consent) under Section 2 of the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Applications for scheduled monument consent (SMC) should be made to Historic Scotland. SHEP 2 provides further details on this process. However it should not be assumed that such consent would necessarily be forthcoming for such works. If you wish to discuss SMC, please contact the relevant area Inspector of Ancient Monuments, in writing at this address.

3.2. Properties in Care: Historic Scotland should also be consulted on any proposals to upgrade or carry out physical works to any paths within the boundary of any Properties which are within the Care of Scottish Ministers and maintained by Historic Scotland on their behalf.

3.3. Listed Buildings: Any works directly affecting a listed structure will require Listed Building Consent. The planning authority should consult with Historic Scotland on works affecting the setting of an A-listed structure.

3.4. Gardens and Designed Landscapes: Proposals to upgrade core paths which pass through designated gardens and designed landscapes, which follow the line of existing paths, should be informed by the existing, often original, path structure. Proposals for paths which have no historic precedent should be very carefully considered to ensure that they will not significantly impact upon the visual integrity of a particular area or, threaten the viability of important trees or planting.

4. Signs

4.1. For proposed signage that may lead to works on a scheduled monument, we recommend early consultation with Historic Scotland. Under Section 2 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, any works within the scheduled area, for example temporary fencing, installation of gates and sign posting, can only be carried out with the prior written consent of Scottish Ministers (SMC).

4.2. In the case of paths which lie within or adjacent to properties in the care of Scottish Ministers we would recommend early discussion with Historic Scotland on the content of signage referring to these monuments and their status.

4.3. Responsibility for assessing proposed signage works affecting listed buildings lies with the relevant planning authority. Where such proposed works involve changes to A and B listed buildings, they require to be referred to Historic Scotland for Listed Building Consent. For further advice, contact the local planning officer but in general terms, signs should be carefully located and it may be more appropriate to place a sign near rather than on a listed structure. Their design should complement the age and architectural style of the building and their materials, colour and lettering should be carefully chosen. The number of fixings should be the minimum necessary, should be non-ferrous and where possible, should be fixed into the joints rather than into the masonry.

Historic Scotland

26 June 2008



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

