

THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL
PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

13th August 2008

Agenda Item	
Report No	

CORE PATH PLAN – ROSS AND CROMARTY
Report by Director of Planning and Development

SUMMARY

The report introduces Core Path Plans generally and the Core Path Plan for Ross and Cromarty specifically. It describes the consultation processes adopted and the Core Paths fit with Council priorities for action.

Committee is asked to consider and approve the Core Path Plan for submission to the Scottish Ministers.

The Core Path Plan and the consultation processes adopted in drafting it contribute towards the achievement of a number of the Council's priorities for action, including:

- Health improvement in the Highlands
- Encouraging “walk to school” pathways and safe cycle tracks
- Increasing the standard of living in the Highlands
- Adopting national standards of community engagement

1. Introduction and background

1.1 Part 1 of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 makes it the duty of local authorities (access authorities) to draw up a plan for a system of paths sufficient for the purpose of giving the public reasonable access throughout their area and to publicise the Scottish Outdoor Access Code.

1.2 The Land Reform Act also requires local authorities to establish at least one Local Access Forum (LAF) for their area. Highland has established six LAFs in Caithness; Sutherland; Ross and Cromarty; Skye and Lochalsh; Lochaber; and Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey.

1.3 LAF's are charged with the following main duties:

- Advising local authorities and others, consulting them on matters to do with the exercise of access rights
- Offering to and assisting with disputes about the exercise of access rights, the existence and delineation of rights of way, the drawing up and adoption of core path plans and the use of core paths.

- 1.4 Highland Council has the power to appoint at least one elected member to the Ross and Cromarty LAF. Following the election in May 2007 there have been two elected members on the LAF. The Council recently agreed to extend the life of current LAFs until Ministers authorise the adoption of Core Path Plans.
- 1.5 There are a number of other duties established for local authorities by the Act, including:
- Upholding access rights
 - Publicising core path plans
 - Reviewing core path plans
 - Review of byelaws providing public access to land

2. The Core Path Plan – Ross and Cromarty

- 2.1 The term “core path” was introduced in the Land Reform (Scotland) Act. 2003. It has been adopted to designate key paths in the access authority’s core path plan and will in due course appear on Ordnance Survey maps as dashed purple lines. Core paths will be catalogued, mapped and displayed by access authorities and will be signposted to encourage people to feel more confident in using them.
- 2.2 The Highland Council has developed 10 criteria and reasons why a path might be considered as a potential core path. These criteria, listed below, have been adapted from the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 and guidance received from Ministers, SNH and the Paths for All Partnership. The more criteria a path meets the more likely it is to be considered a potential core path. Criteria are:
- Linking settlements
 - Access to places of interest
 - Community demand
 - Multi-use potential
 - Access to facilities
 - Assist Land Management
 - Safe and fit for purpose
 - Consistent with Access Strategy
 - Close to where people live
 - Links and supports wider (path) networks

3. Consultations undertaken

- 3.1 Throughout the development of the draft Core Path Plan, consultation processes have sought to apply the principles contained within Planning Advice Note (PAN) 81: Community Engagement Planning With People. Consultation processes have therefore also recognised the Council's commitment to adopting national standards of community engagement.
- 3.2 Two rounds of informal consultation took place in preparing the draft Core Path Plan.

- 3.3 Between March 2006 to May 2007, stage 1 public consultation meetings were held (54 in all) within Ross and Cromarty. 775 written contributions were gathered at the stage 1 consultation. These contributions and the advice of the Ross and Cromarty LAF informed the consultative draft core path plan, which was the subject of stage 2 public consultations.
- 3.4 Stage 2 consultations took place between September and November 2007, when 7 drop-in events were held around Ross and Cromarty, with at least one in each Ward.. At this stage, draft plans were made available at libraries, Service Points and in post offices. 105 Contributions were received and the advice of the LAF informed the preparation of the Draft Core Path Plan, which was approved for the twelve week 'statutory' formal consultation phase by Committee in January 2008.
- 3.5 The 'statutory' consultation phase of the draft Core Path Plan for Ross and Cromarty ran for 12 weeks from 11th February 2008 and concluded on 5th May 2008. The formal consultation report is attached at Annex 1 for information. In all, 46 responses were received. Of these, 20 registered an objection and 26 made general comments. Once again, the responses received, and the advice of the LAF has informed the Plan now before Committee.

4. Progressing the Core Path Plan

- 4.1 The Ross and Cromarty Core Path Plan has been made available to Committee Members and is available on the Council's website at:
<http://www.highland.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/what-to-see/countrysideaccess/corepathplans.htm>
- 4.2 Members at the Ross and Cromarty Wards level have already had the opportunity to consider and comment on the Plan. This Committee is now asked to consider and approve the Core Path Plan for Ross & Cromarty for submission to the Scottish Ministers.

5. Public Local Inquiry

- 5.1 Section 18 (2) – (7) of Part 1, Land Reform Scotland Act 2003 deals with objections to Core Path Plans. Generally, if a valid objection is made and not withdrawn, local authorities shall not adopt the plan unless Ministers direct them to do so. Where a valid objection remains and is not withdrawn, Ministers shall not make such a direction without first causing a local inquiry to be held into the "sufficiency" of the Core Path Plan.
- 5.2 To be valid, an objection must:
- have been submitted in writing within the due time period, and;
 - require a change to the core path plan

At the time of writing, there are four valid objections outstanding that will not be withdrawn, with a further six making progress towards resolution but not yet formally withdrawn. Details of these and the Council's response are contained within Annex 1.

5.3 The Core Path Plan for Ross and Cromarty may therefore be the subject of Public Local Inquiry (PLI), probably by written representation if these objections are deemed to be competent but that is a matter for Scottish Ministers and the Scottish Reporter's Unit. Following a PLI Ministers will determine whether the Core Path Plan may be adopted, with or without alterations.

5.4 Following adoption, it will be the access authority's responsibility to manage the information about the paths identified as core paths.

6. Resource Implications

6.1 There are no new resource implications linked to moving to the next stage toward adoption of the draft Core Path Plan for Ross and Cromarty. There may be implications for the Council linked to a potential PLI and future management and maintenance of core paths. These will be the subject of a separate report when appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider and approve the Core Path Plan Ross and Cromarty for submission to the Scottish Ministers.

Signature:

Designation: Director of Planning and Development

Date: 5 August 2008

Author: G. Hamilton: Countryside, Heritage and Natural Resources Manager
(Ext 2568)

Ref:

Background Papers:

1. Core Path Plan –Final Draft – Ross and Cromarty, February 2008

2. Part 1 Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 – Guidance for Local Authorities and National Park Authorities – Scottish Executive

3. Local Access Forums: A guide to good practice, 2nd Edition – Scottish Natural Heritage/Paths for All Partnership.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
1	11	Anthony N Morey, Bogallan Cottage, Bogallan, North Kessock IV1 3XE	X		X		Add a Core path at Allanglach to link church and bus stops. Also suggests changes to wider access network and road links.	Visited the site on 28 .5.08 and assessed as possible candidate. Wrote to advise would consult with owner (FCS) but minded to include. This was supported by LAF on 5.06.08. FCS reluctant to include at this late stage but will send letter offering to maintain the path at current level and repair bridge. Contact Mr Morey on 31.7.08- this was acceptable to him and withdraws objection
2	13	Roddy F d'Anyers Willis, Conon Fishings Ltd per Savills 12 Clerk St Brechin DD9 6AE	X		X		Objects to riverside paths 631.02 and 609.01. Suggests a meeting	After telephone call and letters has withdrawn objection to 609.01 but supports Brahan on 631.02 (see 4. below)
3	15	Ian Hammond, Ellan Vannin, Seaforth Rd Muir of Ord IV6 7TA	X		X		Right of Way closed by locked gate from Gt North Rd to play park, bowling green and football pitches but now blocked at school. Fence could be re-sited to include path, gate should be unlocked and path should be Core path.	Route is NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter cannot be considered valid objection. Issue of RoW referred to Legal Dept

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
4	13	Jim Gilzean, Brahan Farms Ltd, Brahan, Dingwall IV7 8EE	X		X		1. 631.02 Dunglass. Access road privately owned and unsuitable for increased use by traffic. Limited parking currently permitted. 2. 631.10- contrary to s17 of the Act follows old tarmac rd and ends at busy rd thus not desirable to encourage public use and is unsafe. Would also affect new access for new housing development	Meeting on 21/5/08. Put 2 proposals to Estate. 1. retain as Core Path, THC will upgrade boardwalks and review situation in 5 years. 2. Remove as Core Path in return for guarantee for upgrading/maintenance by Estate. Neither were accepted by Estate and prepared to take chance on Inquiry. LAF considered that path is not essential for sufficiency of the network. AO consulted with Maryburgh CC who would support landowners objection to 631.02 but would retain 631.10. Will be speaking to Ward members and likely to recommend removal of 631.02, this is likely to remove objection.
5		Mr N & Mrs CJ Chisholm The Glen, Kindeace, Invergordon IV18 0LL	X				1.WAN going through land at Willowbank Rd Alness- only acceptable if incorporated into Planning Conditions. 2. Should include route from Wester Calriche to Old Tullich schoolhouse as WAN. 3. Why are there no WAN routes shown on Balnagown Estate	Routes are NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter cannot be considered valid objection. Objection withdrawn with conditions on alteration to WAN agreed.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
6		MG Williams GBB Estates Ltd c/o Smith Nicholas 2 Friarsgate Grosvenor St Chester CH1 1XG	X		X		619.03 Melvaig-Rua Reidh- Camus Mhor. 1. Car parking at Melvaig and Lighthouse- no space for lots of cars. As private road increased use will damage surface and be a hazard. 2. Track to Camus Mor is steep and dangerous and easy to get lost in mist-unsuitable for a Core Path.	Route will be waymarked to ensure safe route plus a cautionary conditions sign. Meeting 31.7.08, agreed to consider splitting route and keeping only road to lighthouse. If path to Camus Mor also agreed to have cautionary sign, waymark safest route, monitor use and review. In light of this will withdraw objection
7		Mr G Tuley, 26 Crown Drive Inverness IV2 3NL	X				Objects as believes THC have not complied with S17 (1) of the Act. There is no basic framework of paths, 1 Urban- many core paths are isolated. 2. Managed agricultural land- few core paths close to communities. 3. Woodland -a lot of core paths and thus more than basic framework. 4.Wild land- almost no core paths. 5. Water- paths here are ridiculous but there is no provision. Unhappy with the split into 6 Plans as couldn't comment in Lochaber. Many communities not linked in Black Isle should include roads and pavements as Core paths. Confused on the path types.	Core path location heavily dependent on demand and current use. Response letter sent jointly with Inverness & Nairn AO to address points raised.
8		AJ & PA Williams, Platcock House, Platcock Wynd, Fortrose IV10 8SQ	X				Maintains objection to route shown traversing garden of house, 3m from house. Breach of Article 8 of Human Rights Act 1998. Also quotes Section 6 of Land Reform Act.	Routes are NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter cannot be considered valid objection.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
9		Eliza Allen, Ord House, Muir of Ord IV6 7UH	X			X	Objects to wider access network route on Map 15 section 52 on the map. The path goes through grounds up the drive and past the house. 1.It is within 3m of front door thus no privacy.2. between front door and lawn.3. hens & ducks have been killed by dogs of people walking here. 4.Dog faeces on lawn. 5.Litter dropped on driveway. 6.Horses leave manure and hoof prints on the grass. 7.Children throwing sticks in pond restrict water flow and scare ducks. Would like to see path moved.	Route is NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter cannot be considered valid objection
10		Olsson Forest Ltd c/o Douglas Orr & co, The Old Manse, Killearnan, Tore, Muir of Ord, IV6 7RY	X		X		644.03 Dalnacroich- object this route and wish it removed on following grounds; 1. Does not link settlements only a circular route within a forest. 2.Access to place of interest- none within forest. 3.Access to facilities- none within forest as commercial woodland. 4.Assist with land management - would have a negative affect, increased management of health & safety issues. Although currently dormant there will be thinning and felling over the next 20 years as per approved Forest plan. Thus public will need to be excluded for safety. 5.Consistent with Access Strategy- although cover by SOAC some areas are excluded such as areas of young trees (under 10 years) are a growing crop. 6 Links & supports wider network- does not link with other paths and only minor support. Thus only meets 4 from 10 criteria and should not be designated.	Responded on 30.6.08 showing that assessment does meet criteria. Young trees are not an excluded area, as Land Reform Act was modified. Further response received after deadline and claims not to have received reply from AO but continues objection . Letter sent 4.08.08 with copy of earlier letter, awaiting response

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
11		John Nightingale, Cromarty House, Cromarty IV11 8XS	X		X		611.08 Ladies Walk-1. it is a permitted path only- runs past the front door and garden of the lodge thus affecting privacy - we retain control of its use (restricting night time use).The tenant feels vulnerable in this isolated postion.2. It does not meet the majority of selection criteria and is unsafe on one stretch.3. Most of route in policies of Cromarty House, a designed garden and landscape, will ensure some access to community but outbreaks of Phytophthora ramorum (a disease threatening native trees) have led to some gardens limiting access and thus control is required.4. Welcome comments from Council from 11Feb but unsure of claim for high demand and would like to see proper analysis. Suggest change of route for Core Path to run from gaelic chapel to East Church. Route through policies would be permissive path and happy to enter agreement. Some conditions requested on 3 other paths: 611.03- being able to continue cattle on this land. 611.018 -again if stock present 611.16- would not want a formal laid track on the Links	Met with owner on 29.7.08. Agreed a possible alternative route avoiding the Lodge, maybe agreeable to CC if completed in short time frame. Have written with what was agreed and conditions. Withdrawal of Objection received 4.08.08
12		Gail Pocock, Cromarty	X		X		611.08- work on the policies of the house expected it to be private ground and Core path would affect ability to work here. Privacy of tenant of the Lodge House- does not meet the selection criteria of linking settlements or places of interest. Uncomfortable with this draft and fear will have no private garden or policies to speak of.	As alternative route avoids Lodge, AO awaiting expected withdrawal of Objection
13		Alison McMenemy, The Lodge, Cromarty	X		X		611.08- concerned about front of house being included. As only one storey people can see into bedroom although most are considerate. There is a viable alternative in the field to the right of the house.	As alternative route avoids Lodge, AO awaiting expected withdrawal of Objection .

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
14		Jack Mackay/David Jardine, Forestry Commission, Millyard, Tower Rd, Smithton Inverness IV2 7NL	X		X		633.06- Military Rd- No alternatives discussed in detail after concerns raised that this was a principal haul route for this extensive forest. No discussion on level of management use and disruption that may be caused by closures. The route is used for car rallying. No evidence of consideration of impact on schedule 1 birds residing in forest. FCS remain to be convinced that this route adds value to the network as it is a single through route and does not link with other locations. FCS believes this is over provision and its removal does not significantly affect the network provided - this route and the public roads will be available under the normal access provisions provided by SOAC.	Alternatives were discussed at Consultative draft stage and not accepted by the LAF. Discussed again on 30.7.08 -guidance states explore alternatives but otherwise can work in existing framework of use of alternatives/temp closures in planned busy periods. Route is already promoted and signed and very popular. The 'connectivity is better than alternative routes, linking to other core paths and communities. Offered to review in 5 years and monitor path with FCS. Possible withdrawal?
							Map 10a 612.05-minded to object to Greenlonachs spur if no Environmental Assessment has been carried out. Map 11 636.04 -archaeological concern suggest shortening path. Map 14 610.05 -ask for removal of route from CPN as haul route and no added value as already available under SOAC. Map 14 645.06 - object unless a formal financial offer is made to upgrade. Map 12 613.14 request excluded on archaeological grounds. Map 15 632.04 expect complete co-operation on haul road. Map 16b-610.03- request statement that bridge is not for horse or bicycles. 620.02 expect complete co-operation on haul route.	Accepted points raised in response and withdrew objections to other routes , provided that THC will discuss funding on some routes.
15		Anne Girvan. Reiff, Altandhu and Camuscoillie Common Grazings Committee	X			X	On behalf of the Chairman and landowner of Reiff Island where proposed path would encourage more people around the Loch. Croft is stocked and dogs worry the stock.	Route is NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter - cannot be considered valid objection

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
16		Sandra Hebenton Senior Town Planner, Network Rail, Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow G4 0LQ	X		X		Map 12, 613.05 utilises Pitglassie North level crossing which is a private user worked private crossing - object to its inclusion. Also on 613.05 use of Pitglassie White level crossing - object to its inclusion.	Response highlighted current heavy use and existence prior to railway and NR provision of stiles. Accepted public use Withdraw objection if sign states 'No access rights under Land Reform Act'
							Map 13, 609.01.utilises Riverford level crossing therefore object to its inclusion.	Route is right of way access to cemetery (first use 1828) but NR gate locked. NR have no recorded public use and thus continue to object.
							The Wider Access Network also utilises private user worked private crossings at 1.Map 4 -Ord Mains Level crossing, 2.Map 12-Brae level crossing, 3. Map 13-Keepers level crossing, 4 Map16b-Rogie level crossing	Route is NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter cannot be considered valid objection. Objection withdrawn
							In addition there are a number of crossings on the Kyle line shown on Overview Map D. Further detail would be required in order to retract some of these concerns. In addition concerned about increase in use of crossing that may be rights of way but not designed for extensive use. Railway land is operational land and is excluded from access rights defined in the Act - this must be clearly stated. Bridges that were to provide private access rights may raise legal and safety issues if encouraging the use by the public and some may no longer be required. We will be carrying out assessment and initiate discussion to establish the Council's interest in taking responsibility for them if essential for the Core Path Network.	NR object to Achnashellach crossing 628.07. Again believed to be a long standing right of way pre-dating the railway. NR have agreed to meet in Inverness in August- still awaiting possible date.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
17		R MacLennan ,CKD Galbraiths, Reay House, 17 Old Edinburgh Rd Inverness IV2 3HF	X		X		628.07 Coulin Pass RoW- note comments made in reply of 19 Feb. Objects to the inclusion of route through Coulin Lodge as only links one part of the Core Path to another thus as an alternative should be removed. The tarmac estate drives used throughout the year whilst having a positive view on public access have concerns on conflict. A Core Path being advertised will increase use of the track past the Lodge. Thus section of Core path south of public road to beyond entrance to Lodge should be removed and shown as Wider network.	Response highlighted right of way signposted for many years, will not increase this. If first section removed would show path starting where there is no parking. AO still trying to clarify and arrange a meeting. At present objection continues
18		Ronald Munro Ferguson, Director, Highland Deephaven Ltd, Novar estate, Evanton IV16 9XL	X				616.02- whilst no objection whilst land is undeveloped, if it is developed in future would want undertaking that path would be re-routed at no cost to us and would not jeopardise development.	Had meeting 21/5/08. Explained industrial land in Act only refers to current use. If future development planned then Path must be incorporated at developers cost. No response received in time limit - assumed Objection withdrawn.
19		Isobel MacKay, Wildlife Sealife and Countryside Trust, 47 Ferry Brae, North Kessock IV1 3YH					618.02- Chanonry Paths through dunes have destroyed wildlife - ground nesting birds greatly reduced. Many path criss-cross and wear down flora. Dogs bolt to beach off lead ,scare wildlife, faeces leaving pathogens. Trust is surveying and will manage in agreement with SNH. Core path adoption will increase and legitimise further destruction of fragile amenity - one path, yes but managed without rights to destroy.	Site meeting on 17.7.08. Addressed the groups concerns. Made aware of access rights and core path would assist in reducing disturbance and erosion working with the group. There was no desire by the group to go to PLI. Objection withdrawn.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Objections

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the plan.		Requires change to plan		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
20		C A Mackay, Gardners Cottage, Ord, Muir of Ord IV6 7UU.	X			X	Objects to WAN route on Map15 section 52 along Ord Drive. 1 it is a private driveway - increase in traffic would increase costs.2. Dog fouling a problem. 3.Path does not link 2 communities. 4. Increased use would scare away red squirrels. 5. People picking flowers & bushes disturb ecosystem. 6 It is not a quicker or safer route to school, shops or community. 7. People digging up leaf mould- disturbing ecosystem 8.Littering increasing. 9- Strategic issues maps , liability etc 10.Residents not aware of CPP- access by stealth. 11.No info on access strategy 12.No visitor attractions. 13. Area not a path but road used by farm vehicle and resident traffic. 14 Impact on privacy 15.Connectivity of Core paths -where to where? 16.Who provide WC facilities to prevent voiding in the woods.	Route is NOT shown as a Core Path in the Plan. Advised by letter cannot be considered valid objection

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
1	9	Jessie B Grant, 6 Anderson Drive Fortrose IV10 8TG		X		X	Would like to see improvements to the old Railway line Path (607.01) to benefit less able. Currently poor condition.	Thanked, noted and funding situation explained
2	9	John McNicol, 3 Wester Greengates Fortrose		X		X	Concerned about deterioration of railway path and would like it surfaced for cycling.	Thanked, noted and funding situation explained
3	9	James Grant, Roskill House, Munloch, IV8 8PA		X	X		633.01 has been shown as extending too far to the east.	Amendment made
4	9	Munloch School Parent Council c/o Andrew Thin, Wester Auchterflow Cottage, Munloch IV8 8PQ		X	X		Please add route to Munloch School from Burn Place. Planned construction within one year.	Amendment made
5		Susan Haslam, SEPA Planning Unit (North Region) Graesser House, Fodderty Way, Dingwall IV15 9XB		X		X	No objection - welcomes possible increase in sustainable transport. Any works that could result in pollution contact SEPA.	Noted and agreed

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
6		Sue Watson, Grazings Clerk 6/7 Badrallach, Dundonnell IV23 2QP		X		X	May own part of Scoraig Path 640.01 but will not maintain it. Currently maintained by Council (TECS)	Thanked, noted and funding situation explained
7	22	Janis & Stephen Love, The Lovecroft Guest House, 13 Sand Passage Laide IV22 2ND		X	X		Propose core path to cave from A832 not shown on map. Also better access to Laide beach.	Site visited on 24.6.08. Unsuitable for core path but will mark as wider access network.
8		Mrs P M Rex, Badentarbat Lodge, Achiltibuie IV26 2YN		X		X	601.09 should remain in present condition. 601.01 will require a number of gates or stiles	Thanked and noted.
9		Miss Dorothy Morgan, Coul Garden Cottage, Mains of Coul Farm Road Contin IV14 9ES		X		?	610.04 Link between Farm Road and Hotel Road is blocked off and under development	Amendment made
10	10	John McCallum St Martins Farm Culbokie, Dingwall IV7 8JT		X	X		Correction needed to wider access network between 639.05 and 635.02. Access to Toberchurn wood will change in about a years time	Amendment made
11	23	Wendy Mullaney, 5 Braeside Gairloch IV21 2BG		X	X		619.02 An Ard -spur into Braeside should be added and not lost in development	Amendment made

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
12	25/ 23	Janet Clark, Scotways 24 Annandale St, Edinburgh EH7 4AN		X		X	Pleased to see additional routes particularly 619.03 Melvaig and 628.07 Coulin Pass, but wonder why west Loch Coulin is now WAN.	Thanked and explained objection from owners
13	4	Mrs E Gerrie, Shepherds Cottage, Easter Kincaig Invergordon IV18 0LF		X	X		There is no access on red route between E Kincaig and Kyalami. Please amend route.	Amendment made
14	15	Mr Shaun MacDonald, Conon Brae Farms, Torgorm, Conon Bridge, Dingwall IV7 8DN		X		X	1. New Kelso - fine 2. Drummondreach- fine. 3. Conon Brae- WAN route past steading may not be safe and may hamper farming activity but OK up to steading. 4. Torgorm and Leanaig- no problem.	Thanked and noted.
15	15	Alasdair Cameron, Wellhouse Farm Muir of Ord IV6 7SF		X	X		624.03 should be connected to roads at Mossend, Brae of Balnabeen and Tore School- these are important historic routes and used by pupils of the schools over years	Noted.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
16		George Hogg, SNH, Fodderty Way, Dingwall Business Park, Dingwall IV15 9XB		X		X	1. Indication of pragmatic approach on Core path decision to include tourism. 2 Aspirational routes referred to but not shown. Could add cycle path between Maryburgh and Tore. 3.Sufficiency to be assessed on whole Council area. Broadly met but could improve to show meet needs of all users. All schools should be reached by a Core Path. Isolated paths could mean parking problems need to designate roads or pavements and possible use of verge and new pavements. 4.Health & Safety -Map 22 606.02 well documented case, whilst happy that access rights apply suggest reconsider inclusion until had time to monitor measures suggested by Forum. Map 23 637.02 and Map 24 619.03 are both in poor condition and whilst not opposing inclusion do suggest upgrading at an early stage. Map 11 636.01 understand can be submerged at high tide and so should have a risk assessment before inclusion. 5. Designated Sites - many proposed core paths run through or alongside designated sites but pleased to see earlier comments addressed. (cont. over)	Met and discussed with SNH on 17.7.08. Agree no changes necessary to maps but comments on sufficiency and meeting need could be shown with annex pages from questionnaire database. Agreed to discuss inclusion
16		George Hogg, SNH, Fodderty Way, Dingwall Business Park, Dingwall IV15 9XB (CONTINUED)					These routes are mainly established or promoted routes and unlikely to have significant environmental effects although will be considered in the SEA process. 6. Biodiversity duty - must be considered whenever works are carried out. Conclusion - generally satisfied but ask to consider above and inform of any decision or changes relevant to SNH interest	

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
17	14	Tim Dawson, 15 Kinellan Drive, Strathpeffer, IV14 9BZ		X	X		1. Good network around Strathpeffer and pleased to see inclusion of link to 645.03 and hope action can be taken against motorbikers on these paths. 2. Pleased to see inclusion of 645.06 to Jamestown although would have liked to see continuation to Cnoc Mor and Cats Back. 3. The strong link to Contin, Rogie and View Rock reflects the feeling at the consultation meeting. 4. Disappointed that old railway track link to Dingwall is not included.	Thanked and noted.
18		R&C Access Panel		X		X	Whilst good number of Core paths for electric wheelchairs there are fewer for manual wheelchairs users and pushers. Information for each best at start of walk. Signposting needs a good colour contrast- dark with light print and lower case. Bridges, steps and other barriers often need edges highlighted for contrast. Car parks may have rough surfaces which can be difficult. Appreciate progress in consideration - keep up and extend the good work. 1. Contin ,Tor View, red route needs boulders removing. 2. Strathpeffer 645.04- currently blocked by fallen trees. 3. Kinlochewe 628.02- excellent facility and recommended.	Thanked and noted.
19	26	Alice MacLennan, Sheildaig CC, Isle View, Sheildaig		X		X	Impressed by Plan and pleased to see our priorities acknowledged. Would like to complete round village path and make safer for buggies. The Aird Peninsula is the most popular walk and is in need of attention. The owner has started a vehicle track at the beginning to improve his access.	Thanked and noted.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
20	6	Ronald Munro Ferguson, Novar Estate, Evanton, IV16 9XL		X	X		Generally happy with the network on the Estate however would like to change a wider access route shown on attached map. Route shown in Plan has not been in use for more than 10 years and has a deer fence and pheasant pen across it, alternative avoids this	Amendment made
21	10	Liz & Joe Darby, Glenburn, St. Martins Mill, Cullicudden IV7 8LL		X		X	Accept Core Paths centre on community demand disappointed not to see more longer route linking. Problem of lack of funds for maintenance will be more difficult with other societal demands. Multi-use fine in principle but do get churned up by horses and become unusable for walkers thus need more attention.	Thanked and noted.
22	17	Donald Campbell, Achiltibuie Grazings Clerk, 132 Polglass, Achiltibuie, Ullapool IV26 2YH		X		X	I have consulted many land users and not encountered any formal objections to the proposed network. Some reservations about control of dogs especially at lambing. On Badenscallie red route land user states a stile is needed as gate is left open.	Thanked and noted.
23		William Kidd Development Assessment Administrator, Historic Scotland, Longmore House, Salisbury Place Edinburgh EH9 1SH		X		X	No objections to the Plan. Many proposed Core Paths are existing paths which cross or are in proximity to scheduled ancient monuments. Any works on these paths will require written permission and HS should be consulted. Also care required in siting signposts	Thanked and noted.

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
24	1	Douglas Gill Brucefield Farm Portmahomack		X	X		Concerns on 638.01 & 638 .06 regarding safety of route and cattle	AO continuing to discuss with CC regarding possible change.
25	10	Killearnan Community Council		X	X		Suggested additions to 624.03	Noted

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
26		Susan Davies, Director Operations North, Great Glen House, Leachkin Road, Inverness IV3 8NW.		X		X	Advice is that further consideration should be given to improve sufficiency in terms of connectivity and geographic coverage. Candidate core paths often appear isolated and disjointed and thus do not always form meaningful loops and networks. Could use more pavements and quiet roads.	This is the nature of Highland geography. The candidate core paths reflect the existing paths on the ground identified through public consultation as the priorities to the communities. Imposing artificial meaningful loops may not result in use by the public. There is also the question of the source of funding to create and maintain loops where none exist at present. In principle we would find the inclusion of many roads and pavements of little benefit to the Core Paths Network for the following reasons; 1. they are already designated as roads and maintained as such, thus at a much higher level than paths are likely to be 2. they are clearly shown on maps for the public to use 3. they are known by the public as available for all non-motorised as well as motorised use 4. there would be confusion on ordnance survey maps if a public road was also coloured with a purple hashed line as a Core Path. 5. they may give users a false sense of security

Draft Core Paths Plan (Ross & Cromarty): Comments

Number	Map	Respondee	Object to the		Requires		Summary of Comments	Response
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
				X		X	Identify a paucity of core paths in sparsely populated central areas	Question whether many of these routes are safe and fit for purpose as core paths.. A number of the more important ones have been included but in general they receive much lower use and used by people who know how to find them and are prepared for the conditions To traverse remote areas safely access takers require to be suitably equipped and experienced. But one hazard to highlight are rivers that rise rapidly over very short periods making routes impassable.