

Sutherland

Overview of proposed action type	Outstanding objection but no proposed change to amended core paths plan	No decision made by officers; input requested from the Local Access Forum with recommendation to take forward to area committee
	Modify the amended core paths plan in response to representations received/resolve objection.	

Comment ID	Core Path Ref.	Respondee	Approve of the plan.			Summary of Comments	Response - Stance	Proposed Action
			Support	Neutral	Object			
23	SU08.05(C)	Ian A Duncan	X			Supports proposed core path running partly on his holding at Creagan Breaca.	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
44	SU09.23(C)	Royal Dornoch Golf Club (Mr Neil Hampton)	X			Supports proposed core path at Embo Links	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
16	SU09.22(C)	Emeritus Professor E David Morgan			X	Disturbance and damage to historic sites. Duplicate and alternative paths available. Lack of car parking.	Path has been promoted as part of the local network since 2013 and there is dedicated parking within walking distance. The route is ideally suited to creating a circular route. The cairns are not scheduled, path passed outside the sites and they are promoted on the Councils own heritage information site, no basis that promotion of path will lead to damage of the sites.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map SU20b Spinningdale
63	SU09.03	Friends of the John O'Groats Trail (Mr Jay Wilson)		X		Western terminus of this core path is obstructed.	Alternative route, suggested by the respondee, has been investigated and is suitable for consideration.	Divert existing core path to alternative route at Skelbo/Fourpenny. See Map Fourpenny SU 18d.
18	SU17.07(C)	Knockan Common Grazings (Margaret J M Strang)			X	Deterioration of the path due to severe weather. Encouragement of walking with dogs in an area used for livestock and lambing.	This path was included in the amended plan on the basis that it has been promoted by the occupier(s) since 2006 and that there are no other core paths within the Elphin settlement. Discussions with the occupier during the drawing up of the amended plan suggested there was continued support for this route. Concerns relate primarily to the in-bye areas of the proposed core path.	There are two options to remove this objection, no decision yet made by officers. 1) Remove the whole proposed core path or 2) Remove the section covered by the in-bye ground (retaining the route to Uamh an Tartair). Retaining the whole proposed core path leaving an outstanding objection remains an option 3).
43		Ledmore & Kanchulish Estate			X	Suggests that the route (from Blar a Chuail to Uamh an Tartair caves) is already well used but is of limited interest only for cavers and pot holer, so insufficient public interest to justify as a core path. Area is potentially dangerous due to collapsed caves and sudden drops, so without significant infrastructure works it would be irresponsible to promote on the grounds of public safety. Furthermore path itself is very rough or non-existent and unsuitable for increased footfall. Designation could result in increase in potential liability for the landowner. In addition the route, if promoted, could cause additional disruption and problems for deer population movements and deer stalking operations. Increased disturbance is likely to push deer SW potentially down to the public road at Knockan or Langwell. Disturbance could be exacerbated if enhanced public access result in walker seeking a return via Knockan Crags.	This path was included in the amended plan on the basis that it has been promoted by the occupier(s) since 2006 and that there are no other core paths within the Elphin settlement. The respondee acknowledges the route is already well used and given the route has been long promoted in walks booklets (since the late 1980's) and now on line (walkhighlands.com etc.) the respondee only seems concerned about the promotion of the route as a formal core path not promotion in its own right. such unease about the core path status does not seem reasonable. Concerns relate only to the hill area of the proposed core path to Uamh an Tartair.	No decision has been yet made by officers, options to resolve this objection include option 1) as above. Or 4) remove the hill route to Uamh an Tartair. Retaining the whole proposed core path leaving an outstanding objection remains an option 3).

Comment ID	Core Path Ref.	Respondee	Approve of the plan.			Summary of Comments	Response - Stance	Proposed Action
			Support	Neutral	Object			
2 & 3 (repeated comment)	RC15.13(C)	Ted Venn		X		Improvements required at western end so that walkers can safely traverse a ditch. Unsure why it should be included in core paths plan as route already promoted in guide books etc.	Consultations with Transport Planning in Highland Council led to an objection from them about the inclusion of this route in the amended core paths plan	Remove core path from amended plan. Route objected to by Transport Planning Team. See modified Map SU 19c Struie.
33		Mr Michael Brown	X			This would be an excellent addition to the local network. However access point demand formal safe parking at both ends, in particular the B9176 where is also a road side ditch to be bridged.		
38		Edderton Community Council	X			ECC promotes the creation of this core path, however suitable parking facilities at both ends of this linear route need to be formally established. It is also important that a safe means of crossing the roadside ditch are provided. There are some sections where steps or switchback need to be put in place to avoid erosion and so safety.		
55		Mr Simon Andrew Lockwood			X	Route does fulfil basis strategy of linkage on a strategic scale; core paths should provide all ability routes giving strategic links on safe paths and this would be expected by the public. As exists this route does not offer a safe walking environment due to precipitous terrain of crags, scree, bogs and ditches. The exit onto the busy B9176 end is ridiculous in the extreme, there is no formal parking. Much modification to the route and to provision for parking would be required in order to allow suitable use at a disproportionately high cost.		
4		Mr Ted Venn			X	Interaction with the public on track used for timber lorries. Risk of accidents on B9176. No car parking facilities. Proposal of alternative to suggested core path route.		
6	Fountains Forestry UK Ltd (Mr Douglas Murray)			X	Object on grounds on public safety, no space on track for HGVs and pedestrians. Risk of accidents on B9176. No car parking facilities	Consultations with Transport Planning in Highland Council led to concerns from them about the inclusion of this route in the amended core paths plan	Remove core path from amended plan. Route not supported by Community Council or Transport Planning Team. See modified Map SU 19c Struie.	
30	Mr Michael Brown				Interaction with the public on track used for timber lorries. Risk of accidents on B9176. No car parking facilities. Proposal of alternative to suggested core path route.			
41	Edderton Community Council			X	Proposed core path uses a route upgraded for timber haulage which would mean timber lorries using route past the primary school. Inappropriate to promote recreational use of this route. No parking on B9176 leading to blocking of the bellmouth. Alternative route proposed.			
57	Mr Simon Andrew Lockwood			X	Proposal is totally against the principals of the core path and national guidance, hinders the safe use of the countryside and impacts directly on the effectiveness of land management operations. There are no provisions for access takers to safely use this route due to limitations of width, inclines, bends, 44tonne lorries, ditches and deep peat. Within the adjacent forest harvesting and extraction equipment with 150m+ risk zones. The B9176 has no facilities for safe public use or parking, it is unsuitable for walking and risk of cars blocking access to the track for forestry purposes.			
45	Ms Eleanor O'Hara			X	Objects on grounds of obstruction of landowners business operation; failure to engage with landowners per best practice guidelines; conflict with strategic timber; safety concerns; financial penalty for landowners and alternative route available.			

Comment ID	Core Path Ref.	Respondee	Approve of the plan.			Summary of Comments	Response - Stance	Proposed Action
			Support	Neutral	Object			
61	SU07.04(C)	Ms Betty Wright	X			Pleased to see additions to the core path network but notes inappropriate signs are in place.	Acknowledgement sent, signs to be discussed with land owner.	n/a
20	SU23.04(C)	Roger G Kershaw			X	Concerns over term "core path" and comparison of the two alternative routes to the falls from the public road.	Following discussion and installation of previously installed map sign at car park objection withdrawn. After site visit there is a proposal to modify the route taken close by the stepping stones, this is to avoid a steep section, an area of bracken growth and utilise a pre-existing gap in the old boundary wall.	Alter proposed core path to avoid steep ground, bracken and utilise gap in old boundary wall. See Clashnessie SU2g Map
21	SU02.01(C)	Greens Chartered Surveyors (Sebastian Green)			X	Wishes route to remain as a permissive path and not classed as a core path.	Objection does raise any material considerations and none were forthcoming after initial letter sent.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map SU25 Loch Naver
22	SU02.02(C)	Greens Chartered Surveyors (Sebastian Green)			X	Wishes route to remain as a permissive path and not classed as a core path.	Objection does raise any material considerations and none were forthcoming after initial letter sent.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map SU25 Loch Naver
17	SU16.10(C)	Highfield Forestry Ltd (Mr Iain Pedie)			X	Route does not meet criteria as a core path because it is an "in and out" route. Conflict with future timber haulage and public.	Loch Craggie is an attractive location and the fact that the track does not form a circular route does not preclude it from being a core path. The Council does not consider the use of the track for timber haulage is in compatible with public recreational access.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map SU22c Lairg
26	SU13.10(C)	Philip Davidson			X	Track passes through an animal control area and farm yard. Proposed deer farm for the track. There are alternative paths.	The proposed core path is already a public right of way and hence a public path. The concerns may be reasonable but the designation of a core path does not alter how the land should be managed or the public exercise their rights of passage or rights of recreational access.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map SU14b Helmsdale
27	SU13.10(C)	Philip Davidson			X	This old road is proposed to become a deer farm and used for access to the hill grazing.	The proposed core path is an adopted cycle path and it owned by Scottish Ministers, the respondent has no control over the management or use of this land.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map SU14b Helmsdale
40		Edderton Community Council	X			ECC supports the creation of this core path but is aware that a considerable amount of work will be necessary before this path can be used.	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
31	RC15.11(C)	Mr Michael Brown	X			Considers this a useful extension to the core path plan	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
39		Edderton Community Council				ECC in general support the creation of core paths where there is benefit to the local community and to the promotion of tourism providing they are appropriately promoted and funds are available to maintain them	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
32	RC15.12(C)	Mr Michael Brown	X			This is already a well established and used path. A core path status would help to further promote its popularity.	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a

Comment ID	Core Path Ref.	Respondee	Approve of the plan.			Summary of Comments	Response - Stance	Proposed Action
			Support	Neutral	Object			
37	RC15.14(C)	Edderton Community Council	X			ECC in general support the creation of core paths where there is benefit to the local community and to the promotion of tourism providing they are appropriately promoted and funds are available to maintain them	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
34		Mr Michael Brown	X			This route is in regular use by both pedestrian and equestrian use which indicates it is suitable for nomination as a core path.	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a
35	SU25.05(C)	Reay Forest Estate (Mr Dugald Lindsay)			X	The estate does not object to the principle of a core path to Achfary however it would request the western leg at Kylestrome is removed to leave only the Maldie Burn track. Also the section terminating at Lochmore is altered to a new forest track between Achfary and Lochmore Cottages	The Western leg of the proposed core path from Kylestrome to the Maldie Burn Junction provides a circuit from Kylestrome and it is proposed to retain the route as promoted in the amended core paths plan. The alternative terminus at Lochmore is potentially an option but need to be assessed against the Councils duty to assert, protect and keep open the existing public right of way that terminates at Lochmore Cottages.	Retain proposed core path at Kylestrome terminus as promoted in the amended plan, see Map SU4b Kylestrome - Achfary Consider modifying the amended core paths plan to promote an alternative terminus at Lochmore. No decision made by officers, need to ensure assertion of existing public right of way. See Map Lochmore SU4c.
36		Reay Forest Estate (Mr Dugald Lindsay)			X	For reason of privacy and amenity we submit that the proposed route is unacceptable.		
52		Mr Robert Woods			X	Track is already covered by access legislation, marked on OS maps and is known about by the hill walking community. Nobody has explained to us what benefits it would bring to designate this a core path and why it needs to be designated as such. There is full public access and we believe there is no need for The Highland Council to assume extra responsibilities.		
56		Mrs Carol March			X	Path already has unrestricted access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders and is obvious to those exploring the area. Track runs through what is effectively our garden and brings people very close to the both the Keepers House, Lodge and outbuildings. We feel that it would not be reasonable to class this a core path and undoubtedly increase the number of visitors unless we would identify an alternative route avoiding the properties.		
	SU11.13(C)					Route of the proposed core path is already a public path in that it is a public right of way, as such when assessing the inclusion of the route in the amended core paths plan the Council does not consider that the interests of the owner would not be altered by a core path designation Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. Alternatives could be provided by the estate but the current route would still remain open for public use and the Council would have a duty to promote and protect such use. Route was included in the amended core paths plan on basis of lack of core paths in the area and that the route provides a long distance route on good quality tracks.	Retain modified core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map Governuisgach SU 8c.	

Comment ID	Core Path Ref.	Respondee	Approve of the plan.			Summary of Comments	Response - Stance	Proposed Action
			Support	Neutral	Object			
48, 49, 50 Multiple Comments	SU09.20(C)	Trustees for Firm of Embo Mains Farm (John Mackenzie Mackintosh)			X	That the proposed core path is land over which access rights are not exercisable, part of the proposed core path runs in close proximity to a piggery and lies with the curtilage of a group of buildings. Route of core path is not used regularly by the public and is a heavily used farm track not suited to promotion of public access. Route is in a poor condition and there is not parking provision in proximity to the proposed core path. Proposed core path would impact on how the land could be managed and hinder ability to use the piggery.	Land is not that covered by provisions of Section 6 of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, areas where access rights are not exercisable. Route links existing core paths and was in a good condition when visited in the development of the amended core paths plan.	Retain proposed core path as promoted in the amended plan. See Map Embo SU 18c.
7	SU03.05	Gledfield Estate (Mr Gernot Langes-Swaroski)	X			This changes takes the core path down a plantation boundary and could be used as a loop route with the Eastern Badvoon path. Public will need to be aware of imminent felling activities and regular culling activities.	Comments noted	n/a
8	SU03.05	Gledfield Estate (Mr Gernot Langes-Swaroski)			X	No provision for parking or collection of dog litter. The low ground is popular for hinds to congregate in winter months, estate has concerns over public safety in this area and difficulties of land management should it be a core path.	Consultations with Transport Planning in Highland Council led to concerns from them about the inclusion of this route in the amended core paths plan.	Consider looking at locations for parking improvements and retain the route in the proposed path plan, if no locations/works identifiable remove route from core paths plan. See Map Ardgay SU 21b.
60	SU07.03(C)	Bell Ingram LLP (Alastair Harrington)			X	Request that The Highland Council consider an alternative route to that which passes through the grounds of Glen Calvie Lodge. Would avoid a number of cattle grids and close proximity to operational deer larder.	Proposed route is a public right of way so the Council considers the route to a public path and the Council has a duty to assert the route. Alternative route would be to be constructed but would provide an improved path for dog walkers, those with young children and equestrian users. Notwithstanding the Councils duty to assert the public right of way the alternative is acceptable	Consider modifying the amended core paths plan to promote an alternative route around Glencalvie Lodge. Need to ensure assertion of existing public right of way. See Map Glencalvie SU 26b.
51	SU19.09(C)	RSPB (Scotland) Ms Abi Ball	X			Whilst the society is supportive of the promotion of the Forsinain Trail, it concerned over the potential timing of the core path confirmation and impact of this on the planning forestry operations within Forsinain plantation. The proposed core path passes adjacent to and through forestry coupes to be felled as well as the forming part of the extraction haul route. This is one -off felling followed by peatland restoration and the society will work constructively with the Council.	Acknowledgement sent, no further action required.	n/a

