

Cairngorms National Park Authority and Scottish Environment LINK

**Consultation held on 16 November 2011
at Westlands Hotel, Pitlochry**

REPORT BY TIM BIRLEY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report summarises the consultation session between the Cairngorms National Park Authority and members of Scottish Environment LINK held at the Westlands Hotel, Pitlochry, on 16 November 2011. A list of those who took part is at Annex 1, and the programme for the day at Annex 2.

1.2 The event had two main purposes. First, it formed part of the public consultation on the two documents issued by the Park Authority on the National Park Plan and the National Park Local Development Plan Main Issues Report. Second, it was planned as an opportunity to explore some of the underlying concerns about the relationship between the Park Authority and the environmental NGOs. The aim was to contribute to a stronger and improved relationship between these bodies, and to suggest ways to improve communication and mutual understanding, and ways of working together.

1.3 The programme was divided into four sessions: an initial briefing presentation by Hamish Trench, Land Use Director for the National Park; then a round table discussion exploring the current relationship, including the functioning, delivery and core principles of the National Park. In the afternoon three breakout groups each discussed their reactions to the consultation documents, each group considered in turn the themes of:

- Natural heritage, landscape and land use
- Settlements, the built environment, and the Local Development Plan
- Engaging and involving people and communities.

A final short plenary session comprised a report back on the discussions, and a review of the outcomes of the day and ideas on how to take the process of dialogue further.

1.4 The report has been compiled by the independent facilitator, and should not be interpreted as binding any of the parties in respect of their consultation responses or any other matter. It is supplemented by Annex 3, the initial statement from Scottish Environment LINK's National Parks Task Force (which was an input to the discussions); and by Annex 4, the transcript of notes provided by the CNPA officers who facilitated the breakout groups discussions held during the consultation.

2. BRIEFING PRESENTATION

2.1 *Hamish Trench* outlined how the two documents out for public consultation from 19 September to 9 December 2011 look ahead for the next 5 years, based on 5 years' experience of the existing policy framework. He emphasised that both are working drafts, not draft final documents, and look at options for managing tensions in the National Park. Taking this forward is a challenging partnership process, and

the consultation is seeking views on whether the documents have the right focus; or whether there are other, deliverable, options which should be considered.

2.2 After consultation, the final National Park Plan will be developed with the aim of submission to Ministers for approval in June 2012. The Local Development Plan (LDP) will then take this big picture and aim to show how planning and development can contribute to delivery of the Park Plan. A draft will be prepared for consultation later in 2012. Eventually, after modifications, Public Inquiry, and submission to Ministers, the aim is to have the LDP adopted early in 2014.

2.3 He thought that the Park's experience has been of successes over both access and species protection, though in terms of support for land management, some had worked, some not. The Authority has plans in place, and success in securing recognition of the 'brand': getting the status of the Park recognised. The long-term vision is for:

"An outstanding National Park, enjoyed and valued by everyone, where nature and people thrive together."

2.4 To meet this vision, there are three Strategic Objectives, of which the first underpins everything:

- To ensure the Cairngorms National Park is a special place where the natural and cultural heritage is conserved and enhanced
- To develop a sustainable economy that supports thriving and resilient business and communities
- To ensure the Cairngorms National Park delivers an outstanding visitor experience and is an international benchmark for sustainable tourism.

These three objectives are then developed through ten 5-year outcomes, a set of Policy Directions, and a Principle for Planning and Land Management.

2.5 Turning to the LDP Main Issues Report, he again sought views on whether these are the right issues; whether there is agreement on the options, or if there are other realistic options. The proposed strategy is based on housing need and demand assessments of approximately 2900 units over a 20 year time horizon. However, existing consents and pending proposals can deliver about 3000 units over that period. Therefore there is overall enough land already allocated, subject to the need for flexibility.

2.6 In response to questions about whether housing projections are based on open market demand, and what about organic growth, Hamish explained that they are based on population projections, and the housing projections of the constituent local authorities. The housing market is not a closed system, and without in-migration there would be population decline, although there is a recent trend of younger people come to live in the Park. Planning applications are reviewed fortnightly, and called in if they are considered significant to the aims of the National Park.

2.7 Asked about the review of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) to safeguard the Cairngorms' rich biodiversity, he said that work has started to scope this over the next 6 months. The National Park Plan and revised approach to biodiversity will be developed in parallel. In adopting an ecosystems approach "rather than just species", there will continue to be protection of priority species. Information on species is not consistent, though SNH specialist advice and information can be drawn on.

2.8 Although the LDP stops at the boundary, the Park Authority do not want to be inward looking. The impacts on the National Park of wind farms outwith the boundary are recognised, and several activities and pilot projects have lessons from which to learn, to and from other National Parks. The Park Plan can (and should) be outward looking. The first National Park Plan set out long term objectives. The Authority is technically required to review its plans, and has to give these a sharper focus because of reduced resources.

3. PLENARY DISCUSSION

3.1 In a wide-ranging and open discussion session, two main topics of conversation were how the National Park Authority (NPA) should work with others, and concern about housing provision.

Working with others

3.2 It was explained that responsibility for a huge area combined with a small body with the budget of a secondary school, means that the Authority has to work as a partnership organisation. It does not take away from other bodies, but has an influential role in co-ordinating and enabling a collective effort. In that sense, it wants to see the National Park Plan co-written with others, including LINK. Overall, it was felt that “no-one can argue with the objectives” set out in the documents or having a partnership approach. At the same time, LINK members felt there is a lack of public awareness of what the National Park was set up for, and that it can be difficult to get public sector partners to sign up to specific outcomes.

3.3 LINK members felt that it was vital that the Authority also has a leadership role, exercising influence and executive power, as well as being an enabler: the National Park would be dodging the issue if it was only a facilitator and did not take a stand on key issues. Learning from elsewhere is important too, if mistakes are not to be repeated. NPA colleagues agreed, while noting that the Authority had had to win people’s trust when it was starting out. The new documents should have a clearer focus and explore different ways of doing things, including looking for new partners. The Park has had a number of successful pilots and innovations (on access and education), and other sectors have managed to get what they want out of the National Park.

3.4 These features are of special importance in the context of reduced resources, which applies to public bodies and environmental NGOs. The Park will secure agreement with the public sector, but it will be difficult when bodies such as SNH are under a Ministerial steer to pull back and concentrate on national priorities (even though there is a concordat on the efficient use of staff). NGOs, as critical friends, can play a very important role, including lobbying with Ministers if need be, and helping to keep resources engaged. It was noted that outdoor recreation is under-resourced, and the voluntary sector itself has to be built up.

Housing

3.5 LINK members argued that the National Park had made provision for far too much housing, with 20% expansion, and that they are not obliged to provide open market housing. It was recognised that provision for housing, and for affordable housing, raises national strategy issues. While the Authority is not a housing authority, it is a planning authority. In England National Parks have a set of tools to deliver affordable housing, but the Authority has set its face against these and

depends entirely on big land allocations to secure the 25% affordable provision. Affordable housing is not a problem which can be solved by one tool alone.

3.6 While it was acknowledged that some development proposals have had a long history, LINK members suggested that An Camas Mor was tucked away in the consultation documents, the site is unsuitable, and development at Aviemore (itself the wrong place to have developed) should be restrained. Failure to do so would jeopardise the first statutory aim of the National Park. For the Authority, it was countered that An Camas Mor is fundamental to meeting housing need, and takes into account community views. They don't want large housing estates in every village, and the Authority consider it is better to focus development in one place where it can be better managed, with an evolution of the development over 20 to 30 years. However, LINK members argue that development is taking place elsewhere too. In discussion about the legacy of previous plans and consents, the Park Authority acknowledge having to deal with constraints, but say they are not following previous plans slavishly.

4. BREAKOUT GROUP DISCUSSIONS

4.1 The afternoon breakout groups discussed three themes which taken together aimed to cover the scope of the consultation documents. The notes of these conversations are set out at Annex 4; this section of the report draws on these notes but focuses primarily on the reporting back in the final plenary session.

Natural heritage, landscape and land use

4.2 *Hamish Trench* said he was hugely encouraged by the extent of common ground and the opportunities for working together. Two such opportunities he highlighted were:

- Working together with relevant LINK task forces on landscape issues, particularly on National Scenic Areas, to engage with Scottish Government. (Both LINK and the National Park Authority want to secure the highest landscape protection, though they differ on how to achieve this – see Annex 4.)
- The potential for joint working on invasive and non-native species.

4.3 Amongst many other issues raised, was the value of an ecosystems approach in recognising the value and role of invertebrates – wood ants were cited as a key example – for which the Cairngorms has the most important habitats in Scotland.

Settlements, the built environment, and the Local Development Plan

4.4 *Gavin Miles* noted the extent of agreement in expressing caution about the pursuit of economic growth, and that the special qualities of the National Park (and a sustainable economy) are more important. This means that the delivery of development should be commensurate with the aims and aspiration of the Park, such as IT improvements and economic development within settlements, or re-use of existing buildings. There is concern that there needs to be appropriate information to take the right decisions. The agreement on this in principle, though not on the detail or what is appropriate at what stage, suggests potential for joint working. It should also be remembered that communities have been hurt and alienated by the history of development in the Cairngorms, and there is a need to help them build pride.

4.5 There was strong support for the low carbon economy, with an emphasis on minimising energy use and reducing waste, more non-windfarm renewable energy, and being more energy efficient. There is potential for wood fuel as long as it is from local and sustainably managed sources, and non vehicular transport should be supported and enhanced. High design standards should be set, and good design rewarded. The LDP should show clearly the sensitive and important habitats that development should avoid.

Engaging and involving people and communities.

4.6 *Murray Ferguson* also reported general agreement on proposed outcomes. This is a National Park, and there should be more engagement with communities of interest beyond the Park (including internationally), building up a constituency of supporters for the Park, and learning from experience elsewhere. There is scope too for working together with environmental NGOs in a variety of roles, not only partnering, but sometimes – such as lobbying – with NGOs in a leading role. The Park Authority should get beyond referring in text and communications only to ‘visitors’ and ‘locals’, and recognise that local communities may need outside ‘key influencers’ to get the best outcomes.

4.7 Different views were expressed on the extent to which local people value the Park, but it was agreed that there is a need to re-engage communities with their natural heritage, and broaden the range of people involved. Success would be seeing local environmental sites appearing on community vision statements. There is a role for more volunteering, encouraging people to join organisations, and do things including local surveys and hands-on action: putting something back (and in some cases, such as exotics, taking it out!).

4.8 There is scope for further strategic work on recreation and tourism, such as what to do about mountain biking, and addressing dogs off lead in relation to capercaillie, for example. Participants were comfortable with the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust’s (COAT) general approach to mountain and lowland paths, though it was suggested that the management structure could be more involving. There is a need for a good integrated public transport and path network between communities.

5. ASSESSMENT

5.1 The over-riding impression from this event was the convivial mood. Those taking part clearly want to see good working relationships between the National Park Authority and Scottish Environment LINK members – a point stressed by both CNPA Board Members present. There was also agreement on many topics, including much of the agenda set out in the LINK Initial Statement (Annex 3) and the CNPA briefing presentation on aims and objectives for the next five years of the National Park.

5.2 Housing was the only major substantive topic of disagreement. Here the differences were fundamental and multi-faceted. They related to housing forecasts; implications for settlements; impact of the legacy of past decisions; and options for securing affordable housing. This in turn raised questions about nature of growth in context of a National Park, and how best to meet needs of both local communities and visitors, while at the same time protecting the natural resource which makes this area so special.

5.3 LINK members:

- Questioned the forecasting methodology and making provision for the extent of population growth proposed;
- Thought that the provision of significant development at An Camas Mor and other settlements put at risk the first statutory aim for designating the National Park
- Challenged the legacy of previous plans and decisions
- Thought that other options (including occupancy conditions) for affordable housing provision should be considered, e.g. with social housing bodies.

5.4 For the Park Authority, it was argued that:

- They have to accommodate their share of the housing forecasts of the constituent local authorities
- These forecasts are made in accordance with Scottish Government guidance and based on the Registrar General's figures
- They also have to have regard for previous development plans and existing planning consents (though not followed slavishly)
- The best way to meet the forecast requirement is to do so in the major settlements and particularly at An Comas Mor, where there is also support from the local community.

5.5 It was noted that some aspects of the debate – in particular the methodology for housing forecasts and options for affordable housing provision – are matters needing resolution at Scottish level, as well as in the Cairngorms.

5.6 One aspect on which there was agreement was that growth should be subservient to protecting and enhancing the special qualities of the Cairngorms; and that the characteristics for which growth should be sought should include resilience, health, diversity and quality.

5.7 Turning to working together, it was agreed that the National Park should look outward, not just to impacts beyond the boundary (though these are important), but also to developing wider relationships as a National park, and learning from experience elsewhere in the UK and internationally. A number of specific topics for joint working and sharing of information within Scotland, e.g. jointly with LLTNPA, LINK and others, were identified. These included resolving how best to take forward landscape designations within planning policy; and sharing information to enable a more sophisticated approach to biodiversity. Exchanges on the importance of invertebrates such as wood ants provided welcome evidence of the merits of an ecosystems approach. However, recognising the resource constraints on all participants, meetings should only be held when there is the prospect of adding value to each other's work (i.e. not having regular meetings just for the sake of it).

5.8 It is not easy in a short report to do to justice to all the contributions and insights from a full working day with 21 participants, so the aim has been to highlight some of the main points. However, the importance of this kind of consultation event is as much about exploring each other's viewpoints, and building a degree of trust and mutual understanding, even if not agreement is not reached on all matters. Therefore thanks are due to all who took part for making it a productive session, and particularly to Hamish Trench and Jen Anderson who arranged to event.

Tim Birley for Cairngorms National Park Authority and Scottish Environment LINK
December 2011

ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANTS

Name	Organisation
George Allan	North East Mountain Trust
Tim Ambrose	Scottish Wild Land Group & Cairngorms Campaign (CC)
Jen Anderson	Scottish Environment LINK
Ross Anderson	Scottish Campaign for National Parks
Stuart Benn	RSPB Scotland
Francoise van Buuren	CNPA Communications and Engagement Director
Chris Cathrine	Buglife
Angela Douglas	CNPA Board Member
David Frew	National Trust for Scotland
Murray Ferguson	CNPA Rural Development Director
Gregor Hutcheon	CNPA Board Member
Gus Jones	Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group & CC
Helen McDade	John Muir Trust
Bill McDermott	Scottish Campaign for National Parks
Gavin Miles	CNPA National Park Plan Officer
Dave Morris	Ramblers Scotland
Eddie Palmer	Scottish Badgers
Hamish Trench	CNPA Land Use Director
Roy Turnbull	Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group & CC
Steven Turnbull	John Muir Trust
Drennan Watson	Cairngorms Campaign
Tim Birley	Independent Facilitator

Apologies were received from:

James Fraser	Scottish Campaign for National Parks
Helen Geddes	Cairngorms Campaign
John Mayhew	Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland
Helen Todd	Ramblers Scotland

ANNEX 2: PROGRAMME

Cairngorms National Park Authority and Scottish Environment LINK CONSULTATION

10.00 – 4.00, Wednesday 16 November 2011
Westlands Hotel, 160 Atholl Road , Pitlochry PH16 5AR

PROGRAMME FOR PARTICIPANTS

9.15 Coffee, tea available

10.00 Welcome & Introductions
Introduction to the Programme
Tim Birley, Facilitator

10.10 Session 1: Briefing
The National Park Plan 2012-17 and the Local Development Plan Main Issues Report
Hamish Trench, Strategic Land Use Director, CNPA

10.40 Session 2: Exploring the current relationship
Discussion around the current functioning, delivery and core principles of the National Park. This includes:

- *What are the main topics of concern?*
- *Do perceptions of what is meant by sustainable development differ?*

12.15 Lunch

1.00 Session 3: Responses to the Consultation documents
Discussion in 3 groups, each considering in turn the following themes:

- *Natural heritage, landscape and land use*
- *Settlements, the built environment, and the Local Development Plan*
- *Engaging and involving people and communities*

3.00 Session 4: Ways Forwards:

- *Taking stock and assessing the progress made*
- *Ways to take the process of dialogue further*

4.00 End of Formal Programme

ANNEX 3: Scottish Environment LINK National Parks Task Force Initial Statement



National Parks Task Force

Cairngorms National Park Plan 2012-2017

Initial Statement

The members of the Task Force listed below propose that the NPP should establish the following objectives and actions:

Biodiversity – the NPP should re-affirm the Park's commitment to securing favourable condition for protected species/sites, especially those protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives, the WCA81 and the NCSA04. In addition, a NP-wide system of second-tier protected sites should be established, along the lines of the Listed Wildlife Sites co-ordinated by SWT or the Sites of Importance to Nature Conservation protected by Aberdeenshire Council

Deer Management – the NPP should support deer management practices which ensure that all habitats across the NP are in favourable condition

Ecosystem Services – the NPP should analyse the contribution made by the NP to Scotland's land, air and water resources and their importance as the basis of economic activity

Energy – there should continue to be no large-scale wind farms within the NP, but support for small-scale renewables including hydro and solar; the NPP should advocate a buffer zone against large-scale wind farms around the NP

Housing – only housing proposals which are not detrimental to the reasons for the Park's designation should be supported. Provision should only be made for small-scale developments within existing village envelopes

Landscape – the National Scenic Areas within the NP should be retained to ensure continuing clear focus on its most significant landscapes

Land Use – the NPP should advocate a landscape-scale approach to land management and the further development of habitat networks that enhance ecosystem function and adaptation to climate change

Recreation – the NP should require an overall Recreational Strategy to tie together the Core Paths Plan, the Outdoor Access Strategy and the work of COAT within a zoning framework

Woodland – the NPP should aim to increase native woodland habitat networks, protect woods of high conservation value from development, improve management of existing native woodland and inspire public engagement with woods

Wildness – procedures should be established to ensure that the 2011 Supplementary Planning Guidance is a material consideration in the determination of every planning application in the NP; proactive re-wilding initiatives should be supported

This statement is supported by the following Task Force members:

- Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland
- Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group
- Buglife
- Cairngorms Campaign
- John Muir Trust
- National Trust for Scotland
- North East Mountain Trust
- Plantlife Scotland
- RSPB Scotland
- Scottish Badgers
- Scottish Campaign for National Parks
- Scottish Wildlife Trust
- Woodland Trust Scotland

11 November 2011

ANNEX 4: Notes from Session 3 Breakout Group discussions

Hamish Trench: Notes from natural heritage, landscape and land use workshops

- General Support for natural heritage and land use **outcomes**.
- **Landscape scale** working – opportunity for connecting estate forest plans together, a focus for targeted advice & support – facilitate & leadership role for CNPA.
- **Catchment management** – support for this as a mechanism to work across ownership boundaries. River Don is the only major river without this approach so far. Opportunity to engage Riverfly Partnership (England based; <http://www.riverflies.org/>). Catchment management a good framework for delivering carbon & flood management and a good basis for land management engagement.
- National Parks should be **exemplar of mitigation** for key species – e.g. otters/badgers, in relation to development and infrastructure.
- Phase 1 surveys on **proposed development sites** not sufficient – need more detailed assessment.
- **Introductions/reintroductions** should be included in plan (link to LBAP) – potential for cranes/beavers etc.
- **Iconic/charismatic species** – recognise these are not always the conservation priorities, but should nonetheless use them to draw in support and engage people.
- **Deer** – Plan should make clear habitat condition is basis. How to influence? Incentives may have little influence, social influence and peer pressure probably most significant lever, but takes time. Disease risk issues?
- **Land Manager objectives** – how to influence?
- **Invertebrates** (pollination) - ecosystems approach provides good framework to be clear about value and role if invertebrates – e.g. wood ants as focus – CNP most important in Scotland.
- **Woodland expansion** – support for principle. Concern that pinewood expansion should be by natural regeneration only, not intervention, at least on uphill side of existing woodlands. Equally, counter view that some enrichment planting may be ecologically justifiable, if not from an amenity point of view. Preference to reduce exotics (any disease risk implications?). Want to avoid clear felling – e.g. Glen Doll.
- **Wildness** – what role woodland? Can absorb people – what do we expect to see in wildness ‘zones’? Plan should be more explicit and robust about hilltracks. Suggest starting from presumption of no new hilltracks. Can plan identify priorities for hilltrack removal? Question how to fund?
- How will **wildness guidance** inform planning? Could there be explicit ‘check’ in planning papers on effect on wildness?
- **NSAs** - Link view that there should be NSAs retained in NPs. NPA’s view that it creates two tiers – want to raise whole Park top level of NSA. Link don’t currently have confidence in NPA’s delivery, therefore don’t want to see NSAs removed – follow up liaison with link task force.
- Should be presumption against **electric deer fencing** on higher ground – difficult for access.
- **Windfarms** – how to address setting of NP – LDP can’t look beyond boundary, NPP can.
- Potential of land use for **carbon** sequestration and storage should be given higher priority. More explicit analysis of carbon benefits needed.

- Remember many people experience landscape from the road – opportunity to extend existing **views from the road** project to safeguard/enhance important views, e.g. A9.

Gavin Miles: Notes from settlements, the built environment and the Local Development Plan workshops

- Lots of comment that the special qualities are more important than economic growth and that a sustainable economy is more important than growth.
- Economic growth must be compatible with special qualities – the term growth has different meanings to different people but there was agreement that Diversified, Resilient, Healthy were all words that could be used to describe what people wanted the economy to be like.
- Support for IT improvements & economic development in settlements
- Delivery of development should match the special qualities & aspirations of Park
- Re-use of existing buildings needs more encouragement
- Need to have appropriate information to take decisions - agreement on this principle though disagreement on the detail and of what is appropriate for different stages of the plan – making and development management processes. Invertebrate survey data given as example
- Help communities build pride – Communities hurt by history of development
- The CNPA Planning Committee should be considering development as good enough to approve rather than not bad enough to refuse
- Strong support for energy conservation - reducing energy use and waste and being more efficient with energy
- More non-windfarm renewable energy should be sought
- Some agreement that woodfuel can be a good source of heat as long as timber is from local and sustainably managed woodland.
- Support for more use of paths and tracks for transport
- Good design should be rewarded. Is there potential for a joint design award or promotion with LL&TNP?
- Agreement on the need to protect Park from development (windfarms) outside
- Work from principle of minimal impact on biodiversity from development
- Local Plan or other easily accessible maps should show clearly where there are sensitive/important habitats that development should avoid.

Murray Ferguson: Notes from engaging and involving people and communities workshops

- Need more engagement with “communities of interest” beyond the Park – it’s a National Park for “Stakeholder groups” (plus those yet to be born - think long term!) very important Gm vs 17000
- Engage with and utilize “key influencers” – going national
- Use the Park as a way to set (raised) standard throughout Scotland/Europe
- Build up a constituency of supporters for the Park – not just “visitors” but engage with outdoor recreational community
- Series of talks/events about the Park – co-ordination and promotion. “Cairngorms National Park lectures” / Create the opportunities
- Write up and sharing engagement opportunities and experience

- Promote the international engagement opportunities and main messages emerging
- Comfortable with COAT (Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust) general approach to mountain and lowland paths – keep going
- Environment management of existing upland paths and paths connecting low ground communities
- Need for good public transport network between (B & S) communities – linked to where the development is.
- Learn lessons from demand responsive transport – Post bus plus.
- Need for integrated transport as part of CRAGG strategy

Volunteering:

- Encourage people to do things
 - Encourage joining of volunteering organisations
 - Point to websites of volunteering organisations
 - Practical cons – taking out exotics in Glenmore (NTS & RSPB)
 - Bring together some volunteering promotion/supervision
 - Put something back
 - Address COAT management structure to make more involving and understand
-
- Make more of engagement opportunities around special habitats and species
 - Empowering communities so that all learning off each other - in non coercive way
 - Community-owned land owners need support/advice/hand-holding
 - More community-based/owned reserves
 - Increase re. democratic elements of CGS – planning for real
 - Broaden range of people involved - new audiences – big role for NGOs
 - Success would be local environment sites appearing on community vision statements
 - Exploit scientific value internationally – safeguard the resources
 - Get away from “only 2 types of people – visitors and locals”. “Local people” need outside influences to get the best outcome
 - CGS have had international influence on culture – support with statement
 - “Cut out the guff. Gaelic died out on Speyside years ago”. People have no connection to culture of their area
 - Need to re-engage communities with their natural heritage
 - Let facts speak for themselves – don’t over-egg the CGS
 - Touch hearts and souls and get hands-on and dirty
 - Core Paths and bikes – don’t make access easier or too safe
 - Recreation stat:- what do we do about mountain-biking? // Address dogs off lead in relation to (e.g.) Caper. // Design and planning of recreation facilities use forest handbook
 - More attention to national stakeholders – they can add to what local people say and want.
 - “Local people value the Park the least” - how the concept of the Park could inspire them. Don’t agree with premise. Lots of people
 - Empowering locals fine – but within limits
 - Share ideas from other places
 - Engage local people in local surveys – local records
 - Use the Park “to find to ways into” local community.
 - Accommodation and housing is biggest barrier to using volunteers more