

## Orkney Islands Council

### Draft Amended Core Path Plan

#### Consultation Report

Consultation Period: 15<sup>th</sup> March to 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018

<u>Unique Reference</u>	<u>Respondent Type</u>	<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Response from Planning Authority</u>	<u>Action</u>
IP11	Interested Person	1	<p>Core Path B6 – Burray Village</p> <p>Our home in Burray Village is bounded on one side by the A961 and on the other by the Core Path (your ref B6) which connects a number of properties, including ours, on the east side of Burray Village with the main village settlement (Shop, School, Pub, Village Hall, Bus shelter). The A961 road, which is the only alternative connection to the rest of the village, has no pavement. Vehicles of all sizes come along this busy road and many ignore the 40mph signs. This makes walking to and from the village a risky business- the only refuge being an uneven grass verge. It is challenging enough for an able bodied person to make this journey and would be positively dangerous for a disabled person or children on their way to school. This situation is only likely to deteriorate when the larger vessel starts on the Pentolina route later this year with the resulting increase in traffic.</p> <p>The path is well used every day by dog walkers, adults going to and from the village, joggers, birdwatchers, holiday makers and children. It connects the group of properties to the east of the main settlement to the main village amenities and connects the village to the beach adjacent the barriers and bay of Sutherland. It is also worth noting that there is an abundance of wildlife in the dune/rough ground to the immediate west of the path through which the Burn of Sutherland runs. I personally have regularly seen Hen Harriers, Kestrels and Owls here and numerous voles and mice.</p> <p>As I understand it the objective of core paths is to give reasonable access for the public to the countryside. This path fulfils the core path criteria of providing reasonable access to the countryside and goes beyond that by providing a safe passage within the village boundaries where there is no alternative route. The path is in use every day of the year.</p> <p>I would strongly urge that this path remain within the core path scheme as it is a vital right of way within Burray Village.</p>	Thank you for your representation which has been noted and accepted.	Retain section of Core Path B6
IP12	Interested Person	1	<p>In Sanday I have used a couple of suggested paths with signs. Farm dogs have not read the signs and don't care for them so have run at my dogs (on lead) and was quite shaken by one very angry farmer having a rant at me. I don't want to be where not welcome or where it is not practical. Some farms and their dogs tolerate walkers through and some not. Please take down signs and claims of walks where not welcome. The farmer has pretty much (so I am told) closed off of the end of the walk anyway. Just not easy trying to find walks when your</p>	Thank you for your representation. Land managers and those seeking to take access must comply with the provisions of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. The Scottish Outdoor Access Code provides detailed information on rights and responsibilities. Specific issues relating to access should be reported to the Council.	None.

<u>Unique Reference</u>	<u>Respondent Type</u>	<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Response from Planning Authority</u>	<u>Action</u>
			dogs are attacked by farm dogs, and you are very unwelcome. I would rather fewer walks with less attacks and making myself unpopular. I would like this email and its contents to remain confidential. I would also like a cycle /footpath from Lady village to Sinclair's shop. But that might be a bit cheeky :)		
IP13	Interested Person	1	May I suggest that the traditional - and most attractive - route for path SR6 heading northwest towards Windwick does not turn inland at Ossi Tang as shown on your current map but follows the cliff northwest until just before the burn between the houses of South Windwick and Windwick, where it turns inland to join the tarmac road at a point where there is already a signpost indicating the way to that route. The route I am referring to can be seen on various existing maps, including: <a href="http://www.walkhighlands.co.uk/maps/map6_2ork.shtml">www.walkhighlands.co.uk/maps/map6_2ork.shtml</a> I have discussed this with Mr Ross Irvine.	Thank you. Your suggestion has been accepted.	Core path plan amended.
IP14	Interested Person	1	We spoke by phone before Easter and agreed that the following error in the updated Core Paths Plan for Papay would be rectified. We own Ness and Stripes, two houses that sit on the coastline at North Wick. The previous version of the plan correctly showed the footpath going along the beach-side of the fence that marks the boundary of our plot. Unfortunately the new interactive map, when zoomed in, shows the path on our garden side of the fence, and going right through our vegetable patch! We agreed that this was an error, as it is not indicated as a proposed change, and that you would have this rectified. Would it be possible to see the revised version before it is finalised so that we can check it for accuracy?	Thank you. This was a mapping error which has been corrected.	None.
IP15	Interested Person	1	Having reviewed the core paths plan I would like to submit a request that on Eday it does not go through Greentoft Farm and rather that the route is changed.  I refer to my letter sent in 2017 requesting that this change be considered and would be very grateful if this change could be made in the core paths plan.  We would like to propose that the route extends from Warness Point over the hill and then down a path that comes to Roadside Pub and then down the main road back to the start of the walk at Maltbarn.	Thank you for your representation. The section of core path that ran through Greentoft farm yard has been removed from the core paths plan.	None.
IP17	Interested Person	1	Roddy As you are well aware i was approached by yourself many years ago now, to enquire if we would be agreeable to have this route signposted as :FOOTPATH to Mull Head: Having just removed the fencing (2000/01) which had been crossing this path since 1959 i agreed to this request and signs were duly erected . After purchasing the farm i have embarked on a programme of road building to gain access to all our fields, and to date we have spent in excess of £100k building over 2.5 miles of roads within the farm.With regard to this particular stretch of track i have spent considerable monies installing	Thank you for your representation. The core path in question is well used and form part of an important circular route that covers the Mullhead Local Nature Reserve and the Covenanter's Memorial. Additionally, the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2016 provides that, as part of the process of amending a core paths plan, representations are invited on proposed changes but not on existing paths which are to remain within the core paths plan. The path in question falls into the latter category and for this reason	

<u>Unique Reference</u>	<u>Respondent Type</u>	<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Response from Planning Authority</u>	<u>Action</u>
			drainage and have to date installed over 400 metres of hardcore. Prior to this, this track was completely flooded and impassable even on foot for 6-8 months p.a. Initially our footpath agreement seemed to work with a few walkers using the route when passable, and this number increased slightly with the introduction of Right to Roam legislation. With the subsequent introduction of the Core Path Network scheme this is where all the problems arose. Having objected to this designation i was led to believe that it would be removed, however i was remiss in noticing that the designation remained on part of my roadway. I am assured by the family of the previous owner that this route was fenced across in 1959 and remained so until i removed it in 2001 We are no longer prepared to accept this situation as it is causing great stress to our family and require our privately owned track to be removed from the register of Core Paths although i am aware that the right to roam remains. Believe it or not we are still willing to have it signposted as a footpath. JF	along with that states above, the request to remove exclude the land in question from Orkney Core Paths Plan is refused.	
IP16	Interested Person	1	We spoke by phone before Easter and agreed that the following error in the updated Core Paths Plan for Papay would be rectified. We own Ness and Stripes, two houses that sit on the coastline at North Wick. The previous version of the plan correctly showed the footpath going along the beach-side of the fence that marks the boundary of our plot. Unfortunately the new interactive map, when zoomed in, shows the path on our garden side of the fence, and going right through our vegetable patch! We agreed that this was an error, as it is not indicated as a proposed change, and that you would have this rectified. Would it be possible to see the revised version before it is finalised so that we can check it for accuracy?	Thank you. This was a mapping error which has been corrected	None.
KA18	Key Agency	1	Thanks for forwarding on the amended plan, but Scottish Water have no comments to make on this document.	Noted. Thank you.	None.
KA3	Key Agency	1	Thank you for your consultation which we received on 15 March 2018 about the above Plan. We have reviewed these documents in relation to our main area of interest for the historic environment. That is, scheduled monuments and their setting, category A listed buildings and their settings, World Heritage Sites, and gardens and designed landscapes and battlefields included in their respective inventories. This response relates to the draft of the Core Paths Plan. We welcome the preparation of the core paths plan and the opportunities it brings for the promotion of and improved public access to cultural heritage. We also consider that they contribute to the positive management and stewardship of such sites. We welcome that the previous core route (WM17), through the scheduled tumuli at the Knowes of Trotty (SM1316), has been removed from the plan. We note that an alternative route of access is planned to the east which avoids the scheduled area for this monument. This will help reduce erosion by limiting the number of people traveling through the monument, while still providing access to visitors.	Noted. Thank you.	None.

<u>Unique Reference</u>	<u>Respondent Type</u>	<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Response from Planning Authority</u>	<u>Action</u>
KA3	Key Agency	2	The majority of the core paths already exist on the ground. Many of these are used or waymarked routes, and a few are located within scheduled areas. We also noted that new core paths (H12 & SR1) may travel through the scheduled area for Green Hill of Hestiegeo, broch (SM1422) and existing paths within the First and Second World War Scapa Flow defences at Hoxa Head (SM3268) will be incorporated into the Core Paths plan. In addition, Path F2 appears to come within close proximity to elements of the Stanger Head Battery on Flotta (SM3302). Path ED3 passes close to the scheduled area at Vinquoy Hill, chambered cairn (SM1410).	Note. Thank you.	None.
KA3	Key Agency	3	Although we welcome improved public access to these sites, please be aware that future restoration or consolidation of paths within the scheduled area of the aforementioned monuments (SM1410, SM1422, SM3268 & SM3302) would require Scheduled Monument Consent in advance of works. Additionally, any signage or ground breaking works, such as the installation of interpretation boards or fencing, would also require Scheduled Monument Consent. Finally we would also recommend that you seek information from your council's archaeology and conservation service on the likely impacts of the proposed core pathS on the historic environment if you have not already done so.	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	1	1. ** we must:- a) Encourage "active travel" for all, including disabled b) Encourage "less" car usage	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	2	2. ** Elderly and disabled often find it easier to cycle than walk.	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	3	1. Please assure that existing "on road" selections of Core Path "Remain" ie:- Proposed deletion of on road sections of core paths on Flotta. They are an essential part of the network for the "disabled" users. Ref. Definition of the word "cycle" . "Road Traffic Act 1986", para. 192c.	There is no need for these sections to be retained as their status as adopted roads ensures that they are maintained to a higher standard than that required of a core path. These routes will still be usable when removed from the Core Paths Plan.	Remove routes in question from Core Paths Plan.
IG3	Interested Group	4	May we suggest that both on and off road cattle grids are converted to active travel / disabled friendly, with side gates for disabled users, ie:- main road from Burnside to ferry terminal in Flotta.	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	5	Please ensure that core paths are "graded" for all levels of disability.	This will form part of a separate project but will be undertaken using a nationally recognised system.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	6	Please assure us that styles will be replaced with "disability" gates, suitable for all users, including disabled cyclists.	Our current policy is to replaces stiles, where possible, with self closing gates that are suitable for use by people of differing abilities. The development of an accessibility policy will help develop this.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	7	Would provision of seat benches, tables , and within reference to Orkney conditions, ie:-lack of trees, bushes and dykes etc, signposted nearby toilet provisions, ensure usage of network by disabled and elderly especially if friendly distance frequency, ie:- not miles apart	Noted. Thank you.	Consider as part of interpretation audit.

<u>Unique Reference</u>	<u>Respondent Type</u>	<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Response from Planning Authority</u>	<u>Action</u>
IG3	Interested Group	8	Scenic location/ viewpoint. ie:- windmill/windfarm sites. Where p[public access is allowed, ie:-Flotta, please assure us that gates, cattle grids, route are elderly and disability friendly, also gates unlocked.	Noted. Thank you. Specific breaches of access legislation should be reported and will be dealt with on a case by case basis.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	9	Objectives: To actively promote within my remit: a) Active travel b) B) Equality Act, 2010 ie:- definition of word "cycle", "Road Traffic Act" 1988, para 192c.	Noted. Thank you.	
IG3	Interested Group	10	Low to longer term "now 2018 till 20 years 2038" a) Orkney wide cattle grids, modified for "active travel" and "disabled" purposes. b) B) Island based cycle parking. Sheffield" "Edinburgh" style.	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	11	8. Kirkwall regeneration: a) Active travel superhighways. Higher priority for active travel	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	12	Home zones: a) Bridge Street b) Albert Street, c) Broad Street d) Victoria Street, e) Main Street c) Urban Low Speed Layouts, 20 mph or lower d) General parking for specified uses "car sharing" e) Development Briefs a) cycle storage "indoor" for flatted developments b)car free housing, c)home zones d) village centres, e) developer contributions f) L.E.Z g) Park and choose ie:- Dounby Road, Finnstown, Airport, "Orkney wide" h) Proposed city bypass. Active travel friendly i) Safe "active travel" crossing points j) "active travel" priorities in urban areas	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	13	8. Low to 5 years a) Regional Planning Authority b) Regional Transport Authority c) OIC Strategic Development Plan, Local Development Plan, Local Transport Strategy, Community Plan, Delivery Plan	Noted. Thank you.	None.
IG3	Interested Group	14	9. Low to 3 years a) cycle parking "Sheffield" (Edinburgh style) "covered" at urban locations, ferry and air terminals, also planning applications b) tapered kerbs c) "cycle space" leaflets. Promote throughout Orkney, especially ferry terminals, airports, public offices etc d) "active travel" friendly employers e) Cycle carriage on public transport	Noted. Thank you.	None.