Response to Adaptations Made to Core Paths Plan in the Light of the Cairngorms Campaign's Objections

Monday 9 February 2009-02-09

We feel that the adaptations proposed for the Core Paths Plan certainly move towards meeting the Campaign's objections. We are aware that our objections can be withdrawn at any time as the process moves towards and enquiry and this can very likely be achieved. We list our comments in response to the adaptations below.

Summary of Objection	Response of Cairngorms Campaign
Lack of definition of what is reasonable access	We welcome the proposal that a clearer wording of reasonable will be included in the plan but feel we would have to see the wording before we could withdraw our objection.
Lack of information on provision for different types of user types within the plan	We recognise the limitations of the current data but consider that the definition of network does require the area wide assessment of adequacy. We would like to see future revisions including this assessment but meanwhile can withdraw this objection
Lack of definition of high quality	We feel that the fact that "high quality" does not mean engineered needs clearly stated and we feel that we must sustain our objection until we see the definition of high quality.
Assumption (implied) that paths can only be upgraded	Need to see revised plan wording before can withdraw our objection – as we feel our core concern of the occasional need to downgrade to protect has not been met.
Lack of clarity in plan as to when/how a core path might be closed/removed/downgraded	Again we feel we would have to see the improved wording before we could withdraw our objection
Lack of match with Local Plan in relation to wild land areas	Again we feel we would have to see the improved wording before we could withdraw our objection