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8.1 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter the development of the Countryside Commission for Scotland's proposal for a Park System for Scotland is examined, mainly through review and discussion of the consultative procedure and the issues which, as far as could be determined, were raised in those consultations. It is emphasised that the concern here is both with the likely structure of the system, i.e., with the number of different elements and the way in which they are likely to be arranged and controlled, and with the goals for the park system, i.e., with the role it will play in the conservation of natural beauty and the enhancement of recreational opportunity.

Throughout this Chapter and the next several public and private organisations are referred to on numerous occasions. The names of the most common organisations have been abbreviated by use of initials and a list of them appears on a fold out sheet at the end of Chapter 9. In addition the abbreviation is stated at the beginning of the section dealing with the comments of each organisation. For example, the Countryside Commission for Scotland will hereafter be referred to as 'CCS' except where 'the Commission' seems more appropriate. Wherever such words as 'the Commission' or 'the Association' appear they refer to the organisation last mentioned in the text.
The Commission was established in 1968 under the Countryside (Scotland) Act, 1967. From a small beginning it has expanded fairly steadily with increasing attention being given to strategic planning in the countryside, advice to the Secretary of State for Scotland and local authorities on landscape conservation and countryside recreation, the provision of specialist services, e.g., in countryside interpretation, and research and development. One of the highest priorities from its inception has been the identification of areas in Scotland which, on account of the quality of their scenery and their national importance for both amenity and recreation, justified special attention under the terms of its Act.

The Commission developed an early commitment to a park system. Although the actual term did not appear in Annual Reports until the Sixth (1973, published June, 1974) it is clear from earlier reports where regional parks were discussed, that CCS had been considering the matter for some time. Thus the report for the year 1971 included the following statement:

"In reporting on progress during 1971 and in the future it would be helpful to be able to do this in accordance with some kind of hierarchical recreation system in which, perhaps, a diminishing scale of areas encompassed by projects correlated directly with a diminishing scale of significance, such as national, regional, local and neighbourhood". 1

In the same report CCS recorded continued receipt, presumably from local authorities, of

"a remarkable array of area-wide recreation projects such as 'national park type areas',
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'wilderness areas', 'heritage sites' and country parks, many of which bore clear evidence of a desire for some kind of officially recognised structure for comprehensive recreation development and management which does not at present exist". 2

That CCS also had been considering a systematic approach for both recreation and conservation is suggested by some statements in its first report (period April-December 1968, published July 1969)

"The steadily increasing use of the countryside will require the construction of a national strategy as well as the provision of facilities of many different kinds ...". 3

"At an early stage the Commission considered .. the need for a .. national hierarchy of scenic resources as a guide for planning the conservation and use of the countryside .... essential if the unique scenic qualities of parts of Scotland are to be conserved ... and ... given a degree of purpose and use appropriate to their character.

Such a system would range from the areas of fine landscape .. through areas of lesser landscape quality where recreation development to accommodate large numbers of users could be accepted".4

The Commission had already received proposals for regional parks in the Bathgate and Renfrewshire hills in its first year. The proposal for a Park System for Scotland was developed from this early and basic commitment in which the "system" was seen as a hierarchy, a term now rejected by CCS though the concept has not changed significantly. The Commission prepared an initial discussion document which it presented to the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs.5

This paper was prepared in 1971 some three years before the proposal was published as a consultative document and almost eight years before it was given wider publicity through the medium of a press conference.
Before drawing attention to particular features of the earliest available paper, it should be stated that the procedure for consultation has two aspects which might reasonably be regarded as undesirable. The first of these was the subject of some questions by the Select Committee. The Committee asked whether it was the duty of CCS to be seeking and pressing for access agreements without waiting for public pressure. The Chairman of CCS stated that the Scottish Countryside Activities Council (SCAC) had "gone on record as saying they are not interested in pursuing this matter of access agreements". The reason was that they were generally satisfied with the position and felt there was a chance that the agreements would prove restrictive, i.e., the same argument that was used in previous debates about Access and National Parks in Scotland as early as the 1930s. The Commission expressed surprise at the SCAC attitude and, in reply to a subsequent question about the "average Scot" who might not be so aware of his "rights" as the members of SCAC, the Secretary (of CCS) stated "the Act (the Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967) was really framed with them in mind rather than necessarily just the present user of the countryside .. we must not lose sight of the interest of these people; they are not organised to represent their views in the way that existing countryside users are organised" (emphasis added). Yet, despite being aware of this need, CCS did not find any more effective way to bring its proposal for a Park System to public notice so as to gauge the views of those otherwise unrepresented. While it might be hoped that
such views would be expressed by local authorities, it is a fact that the same shortcomings in staffing and expertise attributed to them in the planning field also applied in the recreation field. A more egalitarian viewpoint appears to have been put forward by one Commissioner (Mr. Parnell) and the Select Committee drew attention to this difference of opinion on another matter, namely the constitution of National Park Authorities. In the further consideration given to the difference, the majority view seems to have been to limit active consultation to organised interest groups and government authorities.

The second shortcoming of this procedure is that commitment to the form and function of a proposal can become very strong before it is made known to the wider public. This was labelled "multiple clearance" in an article by Lord Bridges in The Listener (25/6/1964). In the attempt to obtain approval for, or at least to remove active opposition to, a proposal before it becomes widely known, the number of people who have endorsed the proposal is increased. Supporters would need to reverse their position in subsequently opposing it or proposing modifications as a result of public representations.

The final forum for consideration of proposals is the parliamentary debate, at which stage organised groups again have the advantage over the wider, unorganised public which has a less definable interest. It is unlikely, however, that there will again be another outright rejection of some
nationally significant classification for outstanding "park" resources, and that an agreed form of legislation will probably be obtained. Thus there is a potential for strong commitment to the form of this proposal from the landowning, management, and recreational groups consulted so long as it substantially accounts for the position they have taken during consultations. A review of the proposal for a Park System for Scotland is followed by an examination of these positions and a description of modifications to the proposal, in so far as they can be gauged in the absence of access to confidential material. Finally, the implications for the arrangement of the parts within the system are suggested.

8.2 THE CCS PROPOSALS FOR A PARK SYSTEM FOR SCOTLAND

In its memorandum to the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs (1971) (see reference 5), CCS stressed the importance of a park system, with or without national parks, to the future organisation and development of countryside in Scotland. The memorandum then included comments on the International Union for the Conservation of Nature's definition of national parks and a review of the establishment of ten national parks in England and Wales and of the situation in Scotland. The latter has been discussed in some detail in Chapter 5 of this thesis. The Commission expressed the opinion that

"... the present overall situation is unsatisfactory. The wide variety of designations, not in any way
A similar view was expressed by CCS in its report, to which CCS added a comment suggesting that a comprehensive framework was urgently needed. It is in order to reduce the extent of conflict which already exists in the general case and which will inevitably increase in the years ahead if we are to accommodate the need to reconcile our varying national and other land uses in the countryside.

The Commission suggested that the park system to comprise national, regional and local parks to form a network of links and small, relatively impervious green areas. It was suggested that the reference as national to the national and regional parks to cover key areas of primary importance for scenery and wildlife from major recreation areas; that there would be a mixture of public and private land ownership; that the park authority would require the powers of a local planning authority and added powers to acquire, develop and manage land and water and to operate agreements on other land; and that the park system would require a park service to ensure comprehensive management.

It is clear that, though CCS considered that the provision under Section 9 of the Countryside (Scotland) Act for the establishment of Areas of Special Planning Control (ASPC) would need to be supplemented, it was intended to apply the ASPC designation to areas of national and regional significance, pending legislation which would permit, inter alia, the establishment of "national parks as a
specific category of protected area" bearing relationship to "the appropriate I.U.C.N. criteria of the day"\textsuperscript{12} (emphasis added).

In Chapter 5 note was taken of the five National Park Direction Areas (NPDA) notified under Article 5 (5) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development) (Scotland) Order 1948 which were, in fact, the five priority areas identified by the Ramsay Committee. The effect of designation as a NPDA is similar to that of designation as an ASPC. Local planning authorities are required to consult the Secretary of State before giving planning permission for development in an NPDA and he consults CCS where any issue of amenity importance arises. An officer of the Commission indicated that the Scottish Development Department dislikes the NPDAs partly because of the amount of consultation involved and partly because it is considered desirable that local planning authorities should be recognised as able to make responsible judgments. CCS considers the NPDA is somewhat out of date, not being consistent with "the new outlook on planning", and that it is of limited value because it is a device suitable only for planning control and not for positive provision and management activities.\textsuperscript{13} Designation as an ASPC "requires local authorities to consult with the Commission on all or selected classes of development proposals and the Commission makes recommendations on how to dispose of these applications".\textsuperscript{14} The Secretary of State can call in applications for determination in the event of disagreement. The Commission
expressed its intention to use its powers to recommend designation as an ASPC to support its proposals for park systems in both 1971 \(^{15}\) and 1974 \(^{16}\) but only one ASPC has been declared. This covers the proposed Pentland Hills Regional Park. CCS clearly had considered the ASPC to be mainly relevant to the highest category of the 1974 proposal, the special park, \(^{17}\) and it was revealed in an interview that the Commission was "unhappy" about its use in the Pentland Hills; that it had been applied because of the perceived urgency of gaining control and affording some special status to the area; that the Scottish Development Department "disliked" the ASPC provision; and that it was now considered that some more positive measure was necessary in "special areas". \(^{18}\)

The main reason for the little use made of the ASPC is that the Commission was attempting to develop a method of classifying land of high landscape quality on a national basis. A study was commissioned and the method suggested in the report \(^{19}\) was tested and found to be unsatisfactory. The Commission proceeded with a further study by its own staff and in 1973 published a report entitled "Scotland's Scenic Heritage" \(^{20}\) which identified 40 areas of outstanding national importance covering about 13 percent of the land and inland water surface of the country. It is now proposed that Articles 7 and 11 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) General Development Order should be applied to the core of scenery in national heritage areas.
because this provides greater freedom to the system of notification. It is understood however that, in the amending legislation now being considered, the Commission is seeking new and more positive powers in relation to national heritage areas.  

The 1974 proposal also contained four elements, but the "linear network" had been deleted and "urban parks" added. This had the effect of making the proposal more genuinely a park system. Although it is not altogether clear why CCS made this change, it is obvious that links and small roadside areas would be much more difficult to integrate with a system of areas with special status, and the 1974 document reveals that CCS decided that the "system" should relate only to land designated as "parks" while other areas would "remain as separate entities, related in terms of overall planning for recreation but not necessarily subject to integrated management". There is no significant difference between the second and third elements in the two stages of development of the proposal but there is some difference in the first element, as shown in Table 8.1.
In the 1971 proposal it was suggested that both national and regional parks would require authorities with the powers of local planning authorities. In 1974 it was thought that the new regional authorities would be able to manage regional parks provided staff were appointed at senior management level. However, in the local government reorganisation of 1975 many of the most important local authority planning powers (e.g., development control) were given to the district councils and this apparently has complicated the establishment of regional parks because the regional authorities must refer proposals to district authorities for planning approval, rather than to another department at regional level. Since any development for recreation within a regional park is
expected to be one obtaining regional finance, in part if not in full, the CCS view is that the division of powers should not be unnecessarily restrictive. A more likely problem was thought to be a desire by a district authority to develop a facility outside a regional park but in competition with it. 23

While the 1974 proposal for park system indicates that the Commission does not now regard either the IUCN or the English model as a suitable one for national parks in Scotland, it is clear from the continuing concern to proclaim "special parks" that some elements of both are regarded as essential. High priority is given by CCS to conservation of landscape and special parks are seen as areas of such high quality of landscape that administration is needed both to control development and to provide positive management. The latter includes positive provision related to the demand for "national park oriented recreation". 24

In the 1971 proposal CCS suggested that regional and national park authorities would "also require powers to acquire, develop and manage land and water for conservation and recreation purposes" and to operate management agreements. 25 Power to acquire land was not specifically referred to in the 1974 proposal, in which the role of local authorities received much greater emphasis. These authorities do have some of the necessary powers under various Town and Country Planning and Local Government Acts.
and Orders, but the Commission apparently feels that these powers and the will and finance to exercise them are inadequate, and the fact that the Commission has recently restated its desire for power to acquire and manage land of national significance suggests that it is not satisfied that local authorities, or special park authorities if they were dominated by local authorities, would have the necessary priorities.

The Commission originally considered that substantial public landholdings would be required to reinforce the ability of park authorities to provide positive management. Later, because the idea of national parks with substantial public ownership was discarded in response to opposition, it was considered that the existing large tracts of public land in Scotland (for example those tracts held by the Forestry Commission and the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland) could be integrated more closely and this would give a wider range of public ownership interests than could be achieved by national park purposes alone. However, in a press conference on 27th June, 1978 the Chairman of CCS made it clear that the Commission believes that the need for public ownership of land is increasing, especially in respect to the conservation of scenic beauty. While it was stated that the Commission's interest "would be confined to areas of high scenic quality and usually of low productive potential" on other occasions it has been suggested that acquisition may be necessary in areas under greatest
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pressure which are not confined to areas of highest scenic quality, and it seems likely that a basic criterion for the designation of special parks will be that they are areas experiencing heavy public use. This being the case, it will be necessary to take account of competitive uses and to have the facility to acquire land so as to be able to provide single-purpose areas where necessary, though this specific problem has received little publicity.

It has been the intention, in the discussion to this point, to show that there were considerable changes in some important details of the proposal for a park system for Scotland between the memorandum to the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs in 1971 and publication in 1974. The limitation on space prevents a more detailed comparison of other changes, but emphasis is here placed on the major change, clearly seen in Table 8.1, namely the virtual abandonment of all attempts to acquire national parks along the general lines recommended by the Ramsay Committee which, apart from the requirement for no material alteration by human exploitation, would have substantially satisfied the IUCN criteria for national parks and related areas, i.e., management by the highest competent authority and public access for inspirational, educative, cultural and recreative purposes under special conditions. Conservation was given highest priority in the 1971 proposal and there appears to have been full recognition firstly,
that conservation will depend increasingly upon integrated management of recreation and other land uses and, secondly, that national park standards for wilderness and nature conservation are objectives which are either unattainable or effectively handled by other authorities. The Commission therefore gave specific attention to the concept of a recreation system as the most powerful justification for a park system for which powers greater than those available in the Planning Acts and the Countryside (Scotland) Act were needed if natural beauty and amenity of national significance were to be conserved.

The fact that this change in emphasis was made necessary by the opposition to features of the 1971 proposal and recognition of some of its weaknesses, ensured that CCS would seek to reduce uncertainty about the arguments likely to be raised in opposition and, if possible, to obtain a consensus before attempting to secure enabling legislation for a park system for Scotland. The 1974 document provided the basis for this search for understanding and consensus in the environment of the planning and decision-making system.

The Commission's views about the procedure for consultation are indicated by a comment in the 1974 document where it noted that it had

"had the benefit of limited consultation about some of the ideas first set out in our earlier discussion paper submitted to the Select Committee on Land Resource Use in Scotland and the proposals set out in this review take account
of the advice we have received. We have not, however, been able to consult as widely as we would have wished and, particularly, we have not been able to seek the views of those involved in local government in Scotland. This we regard as the essential next step in the consideration of this issue. We therefore propose that the Secretary of State should either consult representatives of local authorities in Scotland himself on these proposals or should authorise the Commission so to do. Concurrently or immediately after this consultation we propose that the report be published to allow for its wider consideration by representative organisations and by the public at large". 28

A consultative paper had been prepared in mid-1973 and the "limited consultation" on it was mainly with the Scottish Office, the Nature Conservancy Council, the Highlands and Islands Development Board, the National Trust for Scotland and the Scottish Landowners Federation. 29 The author's information in respect to this consultative paper is confidential, as is a considerable amount of information on comments on the 1974 proposal. It can, however, be stated that the discussion paper was substantially different in some respects to the 1974 document and met with extremely strong opposition. The 1974 document was widely circulated by the Scottish Development Department to planning agencies, government departments and authorities and voluntary bodies in January, 1975. There were, in addition, two television programmes. The Commission considered that not a great deal of comment was received and the strongest reaction came from one of the local authorities concerned with the Cairngorm area which considered it should have been consulted prior to publication of the proposal. 30 Responses to the proposal were received
and considered throughout 1975 and early 1976 and The Secretary of State for Scotland indicated his response in a written answer to a question in the House of Commons on 29th March, 1976 as follows:

"I welcome this Report as a constructive and imaginative approach to the problems of securing both positive development of recreation in the countryside and the conservation of its beauty and resources for the future, and I have been impressed by the large measure of acceptance of the Commission's proposals which emerged in the course of the wide-ranging consultations carried out on the Commission's paper. The Government generally accept the proposals in the paper and I commend the paper to local authorities as a basis for their thinking on these matters. It is however, important to recognise that the implementation of proposals requiring additional public expenditure will depend on their being accommodated within available resources and the Government's plans for public expenditure. I have noted with particular interest the proposals for special and regional parks which, together with some of the Commission's other proposals, cannot be given effect without legislation. Legislation will in due course be considered but there are a number of matters which will require further examination and I have arranged for my Department to examine these in discussions with the Commission and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities".

The "matters requiring further examination" were the subject of a report by what is called the "Working Group". Its terms of reference and the result of its deliberations are noted below.

Before that account is given, it is, however, necessary to explain firstly, the problem of confidentiality and, secondly, the method of presentation of non-confidential information on comments.

8.3 THE PROBLEM OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

The author sought to obtain from the Countryside...
Commission for Scotland details of the background to the proposal for a Park System for Scotland, of progress towards its implementation, and information as to the source of comments, the major issues raised, the comparative emphasis on recreation and conservation, and any other communications or minutes that might be relevant to the issue and available for consultation. The Commission replied that the complicated nature of the adjustment of different interests in the progress towards legislation precluded the opening-up of their records, even confidentially, at that time, although verbal discussion of some of the issues was offered and accepted. The author subsequently wrote to the organisations listed in Table 8.2 on the assumption that they were most likely to have been consulted by the Secretary of State. Because the Working Group report was resubmitted for consultation, the request for information referred to both the Park System document and the Working Group report and, also for that reason, the information received is recorded as a whole, rather than separated into the two stages of the consultation process.

The confidential information received, both written and verbal, provides a valuable background to understanding the adjustments made in the proposal in response to disagreement and conflict with those consulted, but a number of issues cannot be discussed in full and some important points of detail in relation to opinions of the Countryside Commission for Scotland, as well as its
| Association of Directors of Recreation and Leisure Services |
| Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland |
| British Field Sports Society |
| British Rail |
| British Waterways Board |
| Camping Club of Great Britain |
| Central Scotland Water Development Board |
| Council for Nature |
| Countryside Commission for Scotland |
| Crofters Commission |
| Department of Environment, Property Services Agency |
| East of Scotland College of Agriculture |
| Forestry Commission |
| Hill Farming Research Organisation |
| Highlands and Islands Development Board |
| Holiday Fellowship |
| Institute of Foresters of Great Britain |
| Labour Party |
| Landscape Institute |
| Liberal Party |
| Ministry of Defence |
| Mountaineering Council for Scotland |
TABLE 8.2 (continued)

- National Farmers Union of Scotland
- National Trust for Scotland
- Nature Conservancy Council
- North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board
- Ramblers' Association
- Red Deer Commission
- Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
- Royal Scottish Forestry Society
- Royal Society for Protection of Birds
- Royal Town Planning Institute
- Scottish Anglers Association
- Scottish Civic Trust
- Scottish Conservative Party
- Scottish Countryside Activities Council
- Scottish Development Department
- Scottish Landowners Federation
- Scottish National Party
- Scottish Recreational Land Association
- Scottish Rights of Way Society
- Scottish Sports Council
- Scottish Tourist Board
- Scottish Wildlife Trust
- Scottish Woodland Owners Association
- South of Scotland Electricity Board
- Standing Consultative Council on Youth and Community Services
proposal for a Park System, have been entirely omitted from the discussion. In the author's judgment sufficient non-confidential material was obtained to indicate both the type of objection raised and the intensity of the opposition, as well as to indicate in most cases the values of the organisation making the comment. Supporting or alternative information was obtained from submissions by a number of organisations to Parliamentary Committees of Inquiry.

8.4 PRESENTATION OF THE REVIEW OF COMMENTS

There were some problems associated with methods of analysis of data and presentation of information from the consultations in a suitable form. A simple account of the comments on a list of issues was hindered by the confidentiality of some replies and the uneveness of the data. Some replies indicated general agreement with the concept with little or no discussion of issues, while others discussed individual clauses of the document or report in considerable detail. Several experiments were conducted with tabulation of the comments by clause and by theme, but the results required an amount of space at least equal to the procedure adopted, did not improve the clarity of the argument, and were of no assistance to the comparison of different types of interest. In addition a considerable amount of valuable comment both on the proposal and on some wider issues related to it, can be found in evidence given to parliamentary committees of inquiry, notably
the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs inquiry into the use of land resources in Scotland, and the House of Commons Expenditure Committee inquiries into national parks and the countryside and the National Land Fund. In order to permit the incorporation of this material, especially where it filled the gaps in information received from the organisations consulted, it was decided that the most suitable method of presentation was a descriptive account of the comments based on groups of organisations of a similar type, although this has the shortcoming of discursive and uneven treatment. The points raised on some issues are of more general significance to recreational environment and in certain places it is indicated that the discussion is not limited to the CCS proposal for a park system.

8.5 THE WORKING GROUP REPORT

The Working Group was established on 5 April 1976 and met on nine subsequent occasions. It had the following remit:

"To consider certain matters which would be involved in giving effect to the Commission's Report "A Park System for Scotland", including

(a) the criteria for defining and designating special and regional parks, including the need to spread visitor pressures, by whom these criteria should be applied, and the machinery for identifying, determining the boundaries of and setting up such parks;

(b) the nature, functions and powers of such authorities as may be required to manage
special parks, having regard to the existing functions and powers of local authorities;

(c) the relationship between such development and land use control powers as are considered essential for the special park authorities, as part of their management function, and the general planning and other related functions and powers of the local authorities in whose areas such parks may be created;

(d) the interests of owners and occupiers of land in, and of the inhabitants of, the proposed parks and adjoining area; and

(e) the necessary changes in Scottish countryside legislation required to give effect to the proposals in the Commission's Report in the light of the above".

The Working Group's 16-page report covered only points a – d. It noted, but did not discuss, the need for new legislation on a number of supporting issues such as management agreements and ranger services. In regard to criteria for special parks the Working Group suggested: that they would be few in number because of the requirement of national significance for both recreation and the conservation of scenery; that criteria should be only briefly outlined in legislation and applied mainly by the Commission; that each park should be managed as an "integrated recreational concept"; and that the Secretary of State should publish individual park proposals in "a draft designation order in respect of which representations could be made, or if necessary a public local inquiry held". Special Parks Authorities were accepted as appropriate, and it was considered that, "where the special park was created in a district planning authority's
area the district authority would have to cede its planning powers in respect of the park area to the park authority" and would similarly take over as planning authority in the relevant part of the area of a general (i.e., regional) planning authority or overlapping authorities. The Convention of Scottish Local Authorities later changed its initial acceptance of this transfer of powers.

The planning powers of park authorities is one of the most continuously controversial issues in the English and Welsh national parks and clearly will be the same in Scotland. It is not known what attempt is being made to resolve this issue in the legislation being prepared, but the change in stance by COSLA may have contributed to the Commission's renewed attempts to secure the ability to "hold land of national scenic interest" and to "the use of the National Land Fund to make opportunity purchases to acquire land of outstanding scenic and amenity interest when it came on the open market."

The composition of Special Park Authorities, a similarly controversial issue throughout the history of park proposals in Great Britain and no less so now in the national parks in England and Wales, was discussed at length by the Working Group. Flexibility in size (between 15 and 21 members) was recommended, with two-thirds representation drawn from all local authorities in the area of the park, the latter to provide the chairman. It was suggested that the Secretary of State's nominees should be
drawn from land management, recreational, conservation and "other appropriate" interests. As will be seen, this caused some concern to forestry organisations and it is a continuing source of conflict with amenity groups whose argument is that resources of national significance should be under national control, particularly where finance for their management and development is drawn mainly from the Exchequer.

Any more substantial discussion of the Working Group report would greatly increase the length of this Chapter. It is noted, however, that very little attention was given to regional parks, and this is consistent with the pre-occupation of the Countryside Commission with the designation of parks with national (or international) status.

This account now turns to the examination of comments on the 1974 proposal and the Working Group's report.

8.6 COMMENTS ON THE PARK SYSTEM PROPOSAL

Particular items of evidence are contained in:

(a) the responses to the letter sent to interested parties;

(b) evidence to the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs;

(c) evidence and submissions to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee, Environment Sub-Committee;

(d) annual reports and policy statements; and

(e) correspondence and articles in the Press.
It is important to note that difference in judgment on an issue may be based on the motivation of the responding organisation or individual. Judgments based upon the interests of the respondents should be distinguished from judgments based upon uncertainty about the consequences of a policy because, e.g., of lack of information. It is because the judgment about park declaration so often is based upon personal interests rather than impersonal consequences that this is a field so ripe for conflict. That is to say, each party is likely to judge the arguments of the others according to his own set of interests, without regard to the relevance of his premises to the argument in question. On the other hand, there is a tendency not to accept the premises of other parties in the judgment of one's own arguments. This makes for very difficult conflicts in which there is very little hope for agreement or settlement, i.e., one party is likely to emerge as the victor and another as the vanquished. Whilst this may, at times, be necessary, it provides a basis for future intensification of conflict.

Comments on the Park System Proposal: Recreational Organisations

The Association of Directors of Recreation and Leisure Services supported the proposal without making any points of detail. The Association wrote to SDD following its first executive committee meeting in December 1975 (text below). This association could reasonably be expected to
reserve detail comments until specific Park proposals are made, in the meantime exercising some influence through the contributions of their individual Departments to the COSLA review. The Association advised SDD

"That they welcome the proposals in the (CCS) Report and the principles on which they are based, in that they recognise the need for a co-ordinated approach to recreation in the countryside, and provide a means for more effective management of countryside access for recreation and tourism including the development of funding arrangements".

The Scottish Tourist Board (STB) provided a summary of their views given during 1975. The proposal was welcomed as a "worth-while way forward in the proper planning and provision of recreation facilities" and important to the conservation of landscape. The landscape conservation importance of the Park System was supported by STB in their Preliminary National Strategy. STB did not regard the proposal as being contentious on many parts, except in regard to the constitution of Special Park Authorities. Here the Board suggested that the proposed basis for Regional Parks was more suitable.

The Scottish Sports Council comments were confidential apart from that they were "pleased ... to be able to give general support to the proposals ..." While making their detailed comments the Council

"took the opportunity to draw to the attention of the Secretary of State the possibility of disparity developing between the rates of central grant awarded to local projects for informal countryside recreation, and the rates of capital grant to local projects, both urban and rural, for sport and physical recreation". 39

This was a reference to the proposal for grant in excess of 75% for special parks as a general principle, while the
present maximum grant from the Sports Council is 50% except in certain cases.
The Standing Consultative Council on Youth and Community Services generally welcomed the proposal but recommended that

"the development of urban parks should be given at least the same degree of encouragement as regional and special parks since it is urban parks which are likely to be used most by the poorest and least mobile sections of the countryside".

The need to ensure that conservation of the countryside and protection of areas of special interest "does not lead to undue restrictions on access" was emphasised.
The Scottish Countryside Activities Council (SCAC) was in broad agreement with the proposal, and supported the concept of four types of park. It had no comments to offer on urban and country parks.

In regard to regional parks SCAC apparently assumed that these would have Management Boards or Committees and, because CCS had not made any suggestions on the structure (size or composition) of such boards, SCAC recommended that appointment of a 25% "amenity interest" membership should be made a statutory obligation. They equated this "amenity interest" with "central government interest", suggesting that this would provide the Boards with

"specialist experience on recreational/conservationist aspects which elected Regional or District Councillors are unlikely to possess".

SCAC suggested that there should be an "ever-riding precedence (for) conservation vis-a-vis recreation" in regional parks, a suggestion which seems to have been based, at least in part, on a misreading of the proposal
for a Park System, to the effect that it assumed that recreation would normally be the dominant land-use, whereas CCS stated that this would be the case only in parts. SCAC expressed the hope that "the selection and assignation of regional parks will be done in such a way as to avoid such conflict of interest" between recreation and conservation, a criterion which this study suggests is impossible.

SCAC, along with several other bodies, commented on the increase in visitor pressure following designation of a Park. Its comment illustrated the view that a park would be most useful as a measure to control the intensity of use, and SCAC suggested that designation should be applied only where there was existing visitor pressure or where pressure "can be foreseen to be building up to the land's injury within a space of some five years ahead" and that, otherwise, the area was "better left as an ASPC". At the same time SCAC believes there is a continuing decline in amenity and advocates widespread and immediate application of ASPC designation to all Scenic Heritage areas pending new legislation.

With regard to the composition of special park authorities, SCAC strongly rejected "local control over national assets" and suggested that two-thirds representation from local government had been "found wrong" on English National Park Committees.

In the author's opinion the over-riding priority
for conservation on the part of SCAC shows a surprising lack of concern for improvement of access to the countryside and is indicative of the way in which many organisations gave priority to maintenance of the status-quo in relation to the interests of their present membership. The fact that SCAC, an organisation ostensibly concerned with the fostering of countryside activities, so heavily supported low intensity use suggests that most attention will continue to be focussed on special parks, to the detriment of development of urban and urban fringe open space, and consequent weakness of the park system as a whole.

The Scottish Branch of the British Field Sports Society was mainly concerned about possible limitations on shooting and with attempts to ban certain sports altogether on grounds of conservation and the prevention of cruelty. In conversation, the secretary of the Scottish Branch indicated that the Society most feared the establishment of parks because the suggested areas contained some of the highest quality deer forests and grouse moors. There was concern that the general public sympathy for access could be "taken-over" by those who wished "to ban what they call blood-sports". There was little objection to parks in principle provided that they did not affect land or sporting rights. When it was suggested that very strict management of all land use might be necessary, he said that the Society would use all its influence to ensure that the freedom to exercise sporting rights was maintained.

The Society, in its own words, "runs a notably effective
The Scottish Angler's Association had no general comments on the Park System. The secretary indicated that concern was more with "the legal aspect of angling, management, and the promotion of clubs in Scotland." Through its involvement with the Pentland Hills proposal the Association realised that Regional Parks could incorporate angling facilities, and its experience there did not warrant the submission of general proposals in regard to Parks as a whole.

The Scottish Rights of Way Society had no specific views on the formation of Parks. Its sole indicated concern was that Park regulations should in no way restrict the use of pre-existing rights of way.

The Ramblers' Association endorsed the summary recommendations of the Park System document except for the first in which CCS eschewed "National Parks in the internationally accepted sense". The Association did not specifically call for such parks, but made it clear that it considered CCS was under-rating the national importance of "Special Parks". Most of its comments were directed at special parks. The Ramblers' Association National Council carried a motion at its 1975 meeting which broadly summarises its views. The text of the motion was:

"That this National Council of the Ramblers' Association, while welcoming the Countryside Commission for Scotland's consultative document "A Park System for Scotland", deeply regrets:

(a) that the four special categories of recreation land in the countryside are referred to as "parks";
that the Commission has suggested only one-third of the special park authority membership should be composed of independent nominated persons; and

that the document apparently lacks any sense of urgency in coming to grips with the problems outlined.

This Council calls upon the Secretary of State for Scotland to treat the problems facing the Scottish countryside as matters of urgency which can effectively be dealt with only by much more radical concepts than those which are recommended in the consultative document".

With respect to point (a) the Association's main objection was to the term "Special Park" for the familiar reason that it carries the meaning of freedom for the public to "do more or less what they want" and it preferred the more innocuous title "national conservation area". The author suggests, however, that there is a risk of confusion with urban conservation areas, and it might be argued that nationally important area should not be given an innocuous title and that the recreational value of the areas should not be so completely 'played-down'.

With respect to point (b) the Association stated that it substantially disagreed with CCS that planning in special parks should remain the responsibility of local government, and that the chairman of the park authority should be selected from local government representatives rather than from the total membership. The arguments are related to national demand for recreation opportunities, conservation of national assets of beauty and amenity, and a higher than normal national contribution
to expenditure. The Association thought that no less than 50% of members of the authority should be nominated by the Secretary of State. It suggested that the lesson of English and Welsh national park experience was "that it is misguided to implement a national concept within a local framework". The Association illustrated this point in its memorandum to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee (see reference 40).

The Association did not elaborate on the third point, that of the lack of a sense of urgency. Letters to the Press by the Chairman of the Commission, and her press conferences, suggest that the Commission is pressing for the supporting legislation and that the lack of urgency now lies with the Secretary of State.

The Ramblers' Association also referred to the regional and country park elements. In its view, the regional park concept does not ensure attention to landscape conservation and a supplementary designation parallel to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be introduced for this purpose. This shows some lack of knowledge and understanding of the high degree of attention to landscape in existing regional parks, especially the Pentland Hills where the Area of Special Planning Control (ASPC) mechanism applies and of the Commission's proposal at the time for wider use of the ASPC, since overtaken by the Commission's decision to seek a new designation for the areas identified in its survey "Scotland's Scenic Heritage".
The Ramblers' Association suggested the need for a national strategy to relate country parks to special parks as they are established in order to reduce the impact of public demand for outdoor recreation. The Association considered that, in order to ensure this, CCS would need to have a national strategy on which to base its scrutiny of and advice about structure plans and the projections in them for country park and other facilities for countryside recreation.

SUMMARY

The recreational organisations and agencies which supplied information generally supported the proposal for a Park System, but there was concern on the part of most about the administrative implications of the composition of park authorities. Most comments emphasised special parks although there were some clear differences in priority between the Scottish Consultative Council on Youth and Community Service support for urban parks on social grounds and the Ramblers Association support of country parks as protection for special parks. The overall emphasis on landscape conservation by SCAC and the Ramblers Association shows that the weight of opposition to development aimed at increasing public access to and enjoyment of parks is strongly entrenched in those organisations, particularly the latter, which might be expected to most strongly support improvements and to provide the main counterbalance to the entrenched opposition to increased
access on the part of many landowning and farming interests. The implication is that CCS will not be able to argue that there is strong support from recreational organisations for the development of opportunities for access to the parks.

COMMENTS ON THE PARK SYSTEM PROPOSAL: II LAND MANAGEMENT PROFESSIONS

The Scottish Branch of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS), commenting on the Working Group report, noted that, despite the apparent agreement with its previous contention that national parks on English lines would not be appropriate in Scotland, the outline of legislation therein suggested "that the same animal with all its problems will be born, but with a different name". The Institution's primary concerns appeared to be with management structures and capabilities and it advised that the distinction between regional and special parks would prove unnecessarily bureaucratic. Furthermore, it saw the prime need to be investment in urban and country parks, a point also made by the Standing Council of Youth and Community Services but few other organisations, except where country parks were seen as safeguards for higher status parks.

RICS expressed the view also stated by the National Trust for Scotland, the Forestry Commission and others, that the proposal gave inadequate recognition to the
present role played by the private sector. It is not clear whether this was primarily a reference to individuals or to voluntary bodies. It was suggested that parks should not duplicate but rather build upon the work of the latter.  

RICS registered alarm at the omission of agricultural and forestry bodies in the recommendation that the Secretary of State's nominees to park authorities should represent: (1) land management; (2) recreational use; (3) conservation; and (4) other interests appropriate to the circumstances. RICS apparently considered that these interests were not those referred to under land management.

RICS supported the importance attached to management agreements in the Working Group Report, adding the suggestion that the park authorities should be able to enter into "partnership agreements", presumably with private and statutory bodies, and should have a discretionary allocation from Central Government funds for this purpose. It was suggested that these funds might be channelled through the STB or CCS but no mention was made of the Sports Council.

RICS also directed its attention to the financing of special parks, considering that no funds should come from local rates on the grounds that "it would be quite wrong for ratepayers to be required to contribute to a system in which the majority may have no interest". Three
considerations are likely to make this suggestion un-
acceptable:

(1) The emphasis placed on control by local
authorities, (at the level recommended by
RIGS the membership would be dominated by
the interests of the small resident population
of the parks).

(2) The unreasonable suggestion that local rate-
payers could have no interest in the parks.
Their proximity should ensure that they
obtain the maximum recreational benefit.

(3) The implication that ratepayers would not be
willing to see an allocation made for park
purposes. Considering that priority is to
be given to the areas of highest demand,
notably Loch Lomond, it seems unlikely that
any objection to expenditure in such an area
could be sustained. Strathclyde Region
already spends a substantial portion of its
countryside budget on the Loch Lomond area.

The Scottish Chapter of Landscape Institute (formerly
Institute of Landscape Architects) gave general approval
to the proposal. It was particularly concerned that the
countryside should be considered as a whole and not
prejudiced by the special attention given to nationally
significant parks. While supporting the existence of
the Countryside Commissions, the Institute felt that there
had been a failure in the duty to enhance the countryside
through inadequate understanding of the role of design
in creating beauty and amenity and, by implication, of
the role played by agriculture in the development and
management of the countryside. On the other hand, it
criticised grant aid to agriculture for activities of
questionable agricultural value which were damaging to
landscape and conservation and called for closer integrat-
on of agriculture and forestry so that landscapes being
created under current economic pressures could be "translated into a satisfying new aesthetic". This is a rare public recognition of the potential for new agricultural landscapes to have their own high standard of scenic amenity, and the Landscape Institute's apparent preference for terms such as "guardianship", "enhancement" and "creative design" over "preservation" and "conservation" is here considered to be encouraging in the light of the discussion in Chapter 2.

The Scottish Branch of the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) also gave general approval to the proposal. Its more detailed comments were not available at the time of writing, but the Association's overall viewpoint on countryside recreation planning can be found in its submission to the Expenditure Committee's Inquiry into National Park and the Countryside. Although these comments referred to the park and countryside recreation planning system in England and Wales, many of the points therein are directly relevant to Scotland, or would be if parks were established on the lines proposed. Because these issues are of general significance they are commented upon in the following paragraphs. TCPA emphasised that countryside policies should be seen in the context of city/regional planning, and referred to the importance of Green Belts not as negative policy tools but as having creative benefit for agriculture, landscape, recreation and other purposes. 42 The attention to the Green Belts and commendation of the English Commission's attention to the urban fringe raises the point that it was unfortunate
that a direction similar to that given to the Commission in England and Wales by DOE Circular 4/76 was not given to the Countryside Commission for Scotland. Thus, even though CCS sponsored a study of "The Countryside Around Towns in Scotland", it is not possible to measure the Commission's achievement in provision of country park and countryside recreation against any statutory requirement. However, the point is worth noting here because of the TCPA's observation of three significant shortcomings in the English practice, which clearly would require careful consideration in implementing a Scottish park system.

TCPA referred to the opportunistic nature of provision "prompted as much by the availability of a particular resource as by an obvious demand". (This tendency has been noted in Chapter 4 in regard to Country Parks near Edinburgh). The subsequent comments on the "three shortcomings" of the resulting pattern of facilities merit quotation at length

"Firstly, in terms of location, the facilities are almost wholly geared to car owners, ... Secondly, the facilities in the countryside are almost all geared to informal recreation, with little admixture of sport, formal recreation, and events etc. This emphasis follows from the emphasis of the Countryside Act itself and from the resources chosen. By no means does it always represent the pattern of facilities to which the public would most respond. ... Thirdly, the provision of facilities in the countryside has not markedly alleviated congestion within national parks and other places ...." 43

The effect of these shortcomings was seen to be:

(1) "disenfranchising" of those without cars (and who because of their living conditions could be said to have greater need;
difficulties for the populations of the destination areas;
poor quality of recreation experience; and
damage to the places visited.

While TCPA welcomed the emphasis on the urban fringe they felt that the funding arrangements to match systematic provision were highly unsatisfactory, and this again is a point of great relevance to the proposed Park System for Scotland. TCPA identified fundamental weaknesses in the funding both of national parks and of the areas outside them, an unfortunate opposition between the two, and no guidance as to the priorities. The latter is most important where initiative must be taken by local government within a budget that has no specific component within the rate support grant for countryside work. TCPA observed that:

"local choices for local priorities is a good democratic theory where the financial resources are sufficient to enable choices to be made. But this particular sector of public money is in most cases insufficient even for the most basic of local authority services such as refuse collection or school furniture. In this situation, therefore, little choice really exists. As a result, the countryside outside national park areas, both its conservation and its use for recreation, must suffer, and is doing so". 44

These remarks are taken as support for the contention in this thesis that to recognise urban parks as a component of the park system but to leave the development of their role entirely to local authorities, and furthermore to give little guidance on the location and development options for country and regional parks, while concentrating on the conservation aspects of 'special' parks to the
detriment of their other purposes and values, casts grave doubts on the viability of the proposal. This weakness is exacerbated by the fact that local authorities for which countryside recreation is neither a well-established policy, nor a budget item with reasonable integrity, are unlikely to develop either the staffing or the strategic planning ability necessary to carry out their essential part of a programme for development of a system of parks. If the system concept is genuinely applied, then each part must fulfil its function, and it seems doubtful that the present administrative and financial structures will ensure that this is the case.

The same principle applies within the parks themselves. There have been reservations expressed about the designation of special status (such as Heritage Areas) within the English national parks, on the grounds that remaining areas will be treated as of lesser value. The argument is that the parks were designated as integral units - an assertion of doubtful accuracy - and should continue to be managed as such - about which there can be no doubt. The TCPA view is that integrated management would ensure that each area would receive "that form of protection and creative management which it needs to secure the purposes which apply to the whole". TCPA had reservations about the review of boundaries and creation of new national parks on grounds i.e., concern about the lowering of the standards that are implicit in the concept of national parks.
The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) No official account of the views of this body was obtained, though a member of the Institute indicated that the Working Group report was severely criticised on the grounds that the proposed arrangements would introduce a complicated bureaucracy while adding nothing to, and very likely detracting from, the scope of existing arrangements for protection and enhancement of the environment and improvements to informal recreation. The Institute's submission to the Expenditure Committee did not indicate any fundamental opposition to parks - it felt that these had safeguarded amenity and recreation interests from adverse short term decisions - but it seems to have subscribed to the arguments against the creation of national parks in Scotland at the time they were agreed as necessary in England and Wales.

The Institute, in its evidence before the Expenditure Committee, called for a clarification of national countryside policy. Six specific problems were identified, all actual or potential problems for Scottish parks. The first was heavy pressure on local, usually outstanding, sites, leading to various forms of deterioration and high costs of management. The Institute's solution to this was an increase in the area available for access and subject to landscape improvement, partly in or near towns and partly in more remote areas. Progress in this direction would be improved by partnerships between the public
and private sector. The Institute felt that the Community Land Act provided an adequate legislative framework for such partnerships, but that radical changes in administrative procedures would be necessary.

The second problem highlighted by RTPI was conflict between government policies, particularly in the effect of agriculture and food policies on changing the landscape. The random nature of the application of grants is the main problem requiring coordination. Other bodies have noted the inadequacy of mechanisms to check whether grants were well spent and whether or not they had the desired effect and whether that effect was lasting.

The third problem concerned the financing of recreational facilities from public funds by virtue of the plethora of bodies with such powers and responsibilities and the inefficiency suggested by the low scale of provision actually made. To the author, this is part of the overall problem of lack of coordination and it is to be expected that, where there are numerous organisations with similar responsibilities, the energy devoted to maintaining the organisations themselves must limit the achievement of the organisations' other purposes. The Institute's suggestion was that powers and finance are "too widely and thinly spread" and this is a clear danger in relation to the Scottish Park System. The course the Institute's solution would take is indicated
The Park System proposal implies the same attitude:

"The financing of recreational facilities from public funds should be the responsibility of Local Authorities through whom all grants from bodies such as the Tourist Boards, Sports Councils and Countryside Commissions should be channelled. National and regional organisations such as the Forestry Commission and Water Authorities (the latter not applicable in Scotland, but the HIDB may qualify) should retain the power to provide facilities on their own land only when expenditure can be met by income; otherwise Local Authorities should have the power to finance these facilities on the land held by these organisations, management to be the responsibility of either body". 47

It is hard to see this suggestion proving acceptable or successful, particularly in the case of the Forestry Commission, because of the difficulty in obtaining remuneration from informal recreation facilities. Most Commission facilities would not be provided under these terms unless there was a massive increase in Local Authority funds for the purpose. The author's discussions with the Commission indicated that they would reject the proposal on the grounds that: (a) they are in the best position to know what is compatible with other forestry objectives; (b) they have the staff and management capability and local authorities do not; and (c) the local authorities would be certain to expect that their financial contribution would be accompanied by powers of planning control which the Commission resolutely oppose.

RTPI also referred to the dilemma that resolution of the conservation - recreation conflict in favour of conservation may increase its conflict with the interests of local communities in economic progress.
SUMMARY

The "Land Management Profession" commentators had some specific criticisms of the proposal, particularly of the likelihood that park authorities like those already found wanting in England and Wales would be established. The emphasis on special parks that characterised all but one of the recreational groups was not repeated. All four main organisations - the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, the Royal Town Planning Institute, the Landscape Institute and the Town and Country Planning Association have, on occasion, referred to the need to ensure that proper priority is given to urban and country parks. There was an important recognition, particularly by the Landscape Institute, of the need to accept the inevitability of changes in land use which could, if integrated with good design rather than resisted in an attempt to preserve a traditional appearance, create a "satisfying new aesthetic". This is of considerable relevance because of the bitter opposition from amenity groups to changes in the landscape which result from changes in agricultural practice. Most of this conflict occurs in the English national parks and in lowland areas where hedges are being removed, and it has been the subject of several reports, notably the English Commission's "New Agricultural Landscapes" which has been followed by wide public debate. 48 The aesthetic appreciation on which the opposition is based, however, is common to all parts of Great Britain.
In conclusion, it is observed that the land management profession groups placed most emphasis on the management of the system as a whole, on the likely problems for management and on the supporting or alternative opportunities by which the same goals could be attained.

Comments on the Park System Proposal: III Conservation and Amenity Groups

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) agreed in principle with the Commission's views on urban, country and regional parks; supported its conclusion that national parks are not applicable to Scotland; and suggested that the special park concept is similarly inappropriate. The Society was adamant in its view that resource conservation must be the primary consideration in areas of nationally-significant heritage and that all other land uses are secondary considerations. It emphasised its view that there is a potentially serious conflict between recreation and nature conservation which would be exacerbated by the awarding of special park status to nationally significant areas. RSPB was the most critical of all respondents on several aspects of the proposal and, for that reason, some of its points are noted and commented upon below.

The Society was fundamentally opposed to Special Parks. Its view was that the ASPC designation, if extended to include referral of issues to the Nature Conservancy Council as well as CCS, would provide adequate
protection for nationally significant areas within the existing planning system. On the other hand, RSPB felt that special parks, apart from accelerating demand, would be contrary to the national interests; it assumed that local interests would be fundamentally different to national interests and intrinsically opposed to nature conservation which it regards as the prime national interest. The Society accordingly questioned the proposed composition of special park authorities and recommended that the majority of local authority appointees be no greater than one, with a democratically-elected convenor to have a casting vote. It was not specified whether such democratic election was local or national, but it is assumed that realism would imply local, which explains the fundamental opposition by RSPB. The nominated members "must be all conservationists" (sic). This suggestion is unlikely to be acceptable because it would mean that, while the expert view on nature conservation would be very strongly represented, the expert view on agriculture, forestry, recreation, sport, tourism, education, communications, social development and numerous other matters, would not be put except in as much as these views were available to local authority members through other channels, or held by those members in their own right. Since the RSPB strongly asserts that local authorities do not have such expertise, but make ad hoc decisions through expediency, it seems that a constitution such as that recommended by RSPB would not guarantee balanced decisions,
and so would not effectively reduce the "potentially serious conflicts".

RSPB considered growth of recreation in open country a major threat to nature conservation, particularly to breeding birds. Adjustment to such concern would, however, require: (1) identification of all breeding areas of all sensitive species, information which RSPB and the NCC may have; and (2) strict controls on all land uses, including the recreational aspects of bird watching. While RSPB expressed concern about who would define "acceptable" numbers of visitors to parks, and the basis of such decisions, no indication was given as to whether RSPB would support such controls, or what other options are available to protect breeding birds. The Society identified expansion of the holiday season as the major source of the threat, apparently without recognising that, if satisfactory management is to be ensured, such an expansion may increasingly be necessary on economic grounds.

The RSPB comments on both the original proposal and the Working Group report exemplify the emotive language used by many nature conservation interests, and their tendency to read their own worst fears into the statements of others. For example, RSPB suggested that the Working Group's emphasis on the suggestion that "it should be an essential feature that each park is created and managed
as an integrated recreational concept" would mean inevitable "compromise over nature conservation". This seems an unnecessary fear. An integrated concept would imply that all recreational values (of which nature conservation is one) would be co-ordinated to make a balanced whole. As such the localised priority of various values could be considered unassailable, but the attachment of priority could be based on a well-developed pattern of activities. It seems that much of the concern of organisations such as RSPB is to obtain dominance to such an extent that they can suppress all competition from other uses of the land, particularly recreation. This is contrary to the principle of adaptive systems.

The Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT) is not directly concerned with the broader issues of land utilisation, but rather with the protection of wildlife. As such, it desires the reservation of portions of particular habitats of wildlife importance, sufficient to ensure the survival of those habitats and the wildlife they support. This priority closely resembles the principles used by Parks Canada in its programme for acquisition of national parks. The SWT view may be contrasted with the generalised opposition to recreation in the open countryside of other conservation organisations, particularly as SWT stressed that the need is not to prevent change but rather to maintain a balance between land uses.

The Nature Conservancy Council (NCC) supported the proposal for a park system in principle against the background of its concern for wildlife in general, and in particular
for the 41 declared National Nature Reserves (NNR) covering 80,000 ha., and almost 800 notified Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). NCC requested that it be consulted in advance about any proposals for legislation and that such legislation should give due regard to its responsibilities and ensure that any park authorities established by legislation took account of nature conservation and consulted the NCC where appropriate. This request was extended to include representation on a park authority where the park included a substantial NCC interest, and representation of any other non-NCC conservation interest where that interest was substantial; the latter obviously referred to organisations such as SWT and RSPB.

NCC referred to its experience of management agreements, and offered to share its expertise with park authorities while appealing for harmony between NCC and park authority management where these applied to National Nature Reserves (NNRs). NCC felt it desirable that in any agreement "intended primarily to conserve the wildlife interest of an area, it would appear appropriate to use NCC's powers for NNRs." This might, however, increase the number of SSSIs being upgraded and there is some doubt as to whether NCC would wish to pursue such a course as it could weaken the importance attached to the concept of the NNR. In view of the common argument by conservation interests that attaching a special designation to
an area increase the threat of its overuse by visitors, this clearly could become a serious dilemma for the NCC in its relationship with park authorities.

NCC suggested that some arrangements might be made whereby it would be able to advise the Secretary of State in regard to the conservation considerations relevant to directions to local planning authorities (LPAs), and for CCS to consult NCC when formulating its recommendations to LPAs on applications. The NCC suggestions would mean that it was informed of particular details of all planning applications which the Secretary of State directed should be referred to him.

Paragraph 5.10 of the CCS proposal was interpreted by NCC as suggesting criteria for special parks. This paragraph is in fact very general in its wording, except that it notes that suitable areas "would almost certainly already be under considerable (recreation) pressure". Because CCS then referred to specific areas in which NCC has a substantial interest, discussion about park criteria in advance of legislation was requested. On this point it is noted that the RSPB response to the Working Group report claimed that "no consultation with the NCC has taken place to define how the relationship between Parks and any SSSIs or NNRs within their boundaries would work". In fact, there is close and continuous consultation between CCS and NCC on numerous issues and particular attention to management agreements, SSSIs and NNRs is
inevitable as the proposal develops and legislation is framed. 49

The obvious role for the NCC is to "infuse practical conservation advice into park policies at all levels". 50 There is a considerable overlap in responsibilities of NCC and CCS, primarily because the Countryside Act gives the latter responsibility for conservation and enhancement of natural beauty. The Countryside (Scotland) Act lays down that reference to the natural beauty of an area shall be construed as including reference to the conservation of its flora and fauna and characteristic features. The NCC view is that, despite this, it must adopt a more cautious view of access than CCS because of the fragility and vulnerability of some areas of high importance for nature conservation. This author has been unable to find any evidence, either from publications of the Conservancy, testimony to various committees, or conversation with its officers, that NCC considers that the Commission has ignored its responsibility for nature conservation in its pursuit of improvements to access, though it has been observed that particular developments have changed the balance of flora and fauna and characteristic features in areas such as the Cairngorm plateau. NCC does not appear to regard access as of itself a major threat to wildlife in the open countryside as a whole to the same extent as does the RSPB. The Scottish Civic Trust did not submit official comments on the Park System proposal because its concern is primarily
with the built environment. It is represented on an advisory group set up by CCS to consider buildings in the countryside and expects this to be a satisfactory forum for its views to be expressed. The principle of a coordinating body to consider major planning proposals in nationally important areas is supported by the Civic Trust. Its experience in Scotland is limited because of the absence of national parks, but local branches have been concerned with parks in England and Wales.

The Association for Protection of Rural Scotland (APRS). No information was received from this organisation. Its equivalent in England is at the forefront of much of the most bitter opposition to change in the rural landscape. It is deduced from unofficial comments by ordinary members of affiliated groups that APRS takes a similar stance on most issues related to recreation and conservation in the countryside.

The National Trust for Scotland (NTS) also gave general approval to the CCS report but felt strongly that insufficient appreciation was given to the role of the voluntary sector in meeting the recreation and conservation aims expressed by the concept of a Park System. In view of the weight attached to this point by NTS it is somewhat surprising that the Working Group did not consider relationships between the public and voluntary sector. In fact, the Working Group included among the "essentials" of the approach toward an integrated recreational system: (1) the recreational element of financial plans, structure plans
and local plans; and (2) "continuing and effective consultation between park authorities, local authorities and the Commission (CCS) so that ... the activities of the various bodies which have a hand in providing them (recreational facilities) - central and local government, national agencies and the private sector - can be integrated". NTS was not alone in its alarm that "national agencies and the private sector" were not included in the "continuing and effective consultation" clause, even though their activities were to be integrated.

The Trust's comments on the CCS proposal suggested an underlying concern that implementation of the park system might restrict the opportunities for voluntary bodies "to continue to operate and to expand their activities". Emphasising the importance of voluntary service in the community by reference to the House of Lords Debate on the subject (25/6/75) NTS suggested that "any future prospectus for a park system in Scotland must embrace the voluntary sector". The author's opinion is that the lack of recognition given in the CCS document and the Working Group's report to the contribution of NTS, SWT, RSPB and local groups justifies their alarm, though the actual practice of both CCS and local authorities in consultation with and financial support for these bodies should be better acknowledged. It is fair to say that while CCS failed to acknowledge the contribution of the voluntary sector in its proposal, those bodies, in their comments on the park system, failed to acknowledge the support they have
received for the operation and expansion of their activities. It should, however, be noted that in reply to a question from the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs in 1972, the Trust said that, though there had been no fundamental change in its role since establishment of CCS, it had been able to expand its services, particularly in the fields of information, education, and interpretation. The NTS memorandum to the Expenditure Committee noted that the Countryside (Scotland) Act had been very beneficial, though expressing concern that much more was necessary and that expenditure cuts would jeopardise what had already been achieved. It was also concerned at the costs of management, especially where support for the amenity and livelihood of the inhabitants of an area (such as Torridon) was involved (see note on the National Land Fund below). The essence of the Trust's memorandum was that, because a very high portion of the costs of countryside management are not eligible for grant, any reduction in grant would prejudice the Trust's operations and attention should therefore be given to support and maintenance of existing provision before new projects were undertaken. NTS considers that partnerships between the public, private and voluntary sector are the cheapest and most efficient way of implementing countryside policy and was concerned that if CCS was to attempt to develop a more direct role in provision and management, the scarce (and threatened) funds might be diverted from the voluntary sector.

NTS also considered that wider and better use of the
ASPC provision might obviate the need for special parks, but agreed to support the concept of special parks because it promised greater Exchequer support than was possible under the alternative provisions. Nevertheless, NTS did not favour the term "special parks" because it was not explicit and the Trust felt the identified areas required "exclusive rather than universal solutions" because the problems and opportunities of each were different.

The Trust submitted observations on the status of parks which support criticisms made by the author. The relevant paragraph is as follows:

"10. While the Trust accepts the concept outlined in the Report of a system embracing several categories of park, we feel strongly that from the outset the various types of park should be ranked "in line" rather than in hierarchical association. It is essential that the urban park, its staff and provision, should have the same status and standards as a larger countryside area, although there may be differences in landscape qualities. This is particularly important for the ranger service. A national ranger service with the Countryside Commission for Scotland as the co-ordinator and central agency for guidelines on standards and international exchange on techniques should be an objective of any new system".

Though an officer of COS stated that the Commission firmly rejected any connotation in the proposal of a hierarchy, use of the word "special" gives this meaning even if the other qualifications do not. Both points made in this quotation clearly relate to the integration of management of a high standard throughout the park system as a whole. Inadequate standards of management, unco-ordinated provision and operation, poor placement of, and linkages
between, urban parks and parks in the urban fringe, are the cause of many problems resulting from recreational pressure on resources of national importance for conservation.

The Trust supported the CCS view that special parks should have authorities with planning functions, particularly where a park overlapped several jurisdictions. However, NTS did not at that time suggest how the authorities should be comprised, though it did agree with CCS's concern that some local authorities might, for valid reasons, be unable to give adequate attention to heritage areas and so recommended that provisions for a 100% grant, similar to those of the Historic Buildings Council for Scotland, might also apply to CCS recommendations to the Secretary of State.

Finally, the Trust expressed apprehension about "suggestions that a countryside service ought to be made to pay its way". This was thought to be impossible. The author's opinion is that it is also impractical; such a rule would almost certainly prevent adequate development, and the co-ordination of provision for the widest variety of needs. The National Trust for Scotland and the National Land Fund. Further comments on the proposed park system and related issues of countryside planning can be seen in evidence to a recent inquiry by the House of Commons Expenditure Committee into the National Land Fund. Some of these comments
are referred to in the remainder of this section. As a background to the Trust's interest in the fund it is noted that it has observed on occasion that it fulfils "a range of functions analogous to that of the U.S. National Park Service - on an infinitely smaller scale - and cares for substantial sections of the "national park" areas which were recommended for statutory designation by the Ramsay Committee in 1945". These areas include the Torridon Estate which the Trust acquired through the National Land Fund. If nothing else, the substantial role of the NTS in these "National Park Direction Areas", as they were later designated, demonstrates its importance to systematic recreation and conservation goals in Scotland. But the NTS experience with the Torridon estate demonstrates the extreme difficulty in achieving anything like an ideal national park, let alone a functional park system.

As was noted in Chapter 3, the Ramsay Committee recommended public ownership of the proposed national park areas and suggested that the purchase should be financed from the £50 million National Land Fund. The estimated cost of purchase at the time was £1.3 million. (The cost of acquisition of other assets and compensation payments, development, accommodation facility, housing and other building costs were estimated to bring this total to £3.25 million. Since these costs would be spread over many years, the Committee suggested that £2 million be set aside from the Land Fund over the first ten years of Scottish National Parks). The Government rejected public
ownership and, though use of the Fund for ensuring that the public had permanent access to National Parks was one of the purposes recommended in the parliamentary debate on the Fund, very little was allocated for this purpose. The Fund was used in 1967 to transfer the Torridon Estate to NTS, the property being accepted in lieu of tax at a cost to the National Land Fund of £22,500. NTS stated in its evidence to the Inquiry that it had

"unfortunately learnt a bitter lesson - in financial terms - over its acceptance ... of the Estate of Torridon ... The Trust cannot emphasise too strongly that the management of land and of those who work on it is a difficult and costly business. This cost increases where communities live on the property or are in any way dependent on it for the quality of life". 54

The contribution from Trust funds to the upkeep of this property between acceptance in 1967 and November 1977 was £45,200.

Several voluntary organisations recommended "that the provisions should be made for supporting funds to be provided for National Land Fund properties and that it should be possible for income from such properties to be used to maintain them". 55 This was the essence of the NTS memorandum to the Committee. The mechanism suggested was an endowment or other lands to provide an endowment, such lands being of lower status than that being transferred because of its value as National Heritage. The Trust considered that the annual sums required for an area such as Torridon to make up the deficit
on other grants such as those from CCS and HIDB are "small when set against the incalculable value to the nation of such a splendid area". Section 4(1) of the Historic Building and Ancient Monuments Act (1953), which is very favourable to the National Trusts, contains provision for annual maintenance grants but these do not come from the NLF and apply only to buildings, not to the land upon which they are situated. The point of particular significance is that where free access is provided to the countryside, the maintenance costs for conservation of the natural beauty of open country must be supplemented from public funds. While the original purpose of the National Land Fund has not achieved this, the Trust's suggestion indicates that it would be possible with changes in the legislation, though these would necessitate major changes in the system of administration of the fund. Changes such as those suggested would provide a more substantial basis for the partnership arrangements favoured by the Trust which would particularly welcome partnerships with local authorities. Other changes suggested by voluntary bodies and authorities such as NCC and CCS, such as more opportunity to purchase amenity land by park or local authorities, the holding and management of land by CCS, and transfer of land to the NCC without the requirement for reimbursement, could do much to ensure conservation of the national heritage provided there were supporting funds for management. Such arrangements then might ensure a viable foundation for the proposed park system.
has yet to give its reply, and acceptance of many of the various recommendations must be doubtful; but it seems that, short of some such allocation of much larger sums of money to the management as well as acquisition of land, the recurring problems of the National Parks in England and Wales will not be overcome, and the Scottish Park System, if established, would experience the same difficulties. The matter has a somewhat critical urgency because the operation of Capital Transfer Tax is thought likely to cause a dramatic increase in the number of properties of high scenic, scientific, amenity or historical importance being offered to the Treasury in lieu of tax and duty.

In his evidence to the NLF inquiry Lord Bute said that "the Trust (NTS) cannot become the owner and manager of the bulk of the national heritage" and added that the Trust "must require an endowment, capital endowment, with properties coming through the Land Fund".

"We are not willing or able ... to take a major property through the Land Fund on the basis of annual grants. We feel we must be the judge of our own standards and how we run our properties and if we become too much dependent on State grants we feel our independence and our integrity might be damaged ... Once we have accepted a property ... we are committed in perpetuity for maintaining (it) for the public benefit and to make them (sic) available for the public ... that is our job and because we have these commitments from the past ... we are not prepared to jeopardise our present position because of new acquisitions not properly endowed". 58

In view of this consideration and possible growth in
the number of properties becoming available, the submissions by NCC and CCS take on added importance. NCC has not yet acquired land through the Fund because land in which it might be interested usually went to another body (in most cases NTS, in others the Forestry Commission) with which NCC was able to negotiate acceptable schemes of management. Only the National Trusts and local authorities are empowered to accept responsibility for scenic and amenity land. NCC is concerned that possible recipients

"may not have the necessary special knowledge or the resources for the recurrent management and expenditure involved (or) ... be less inclined to own land where the requirements of nature conservation restrict their use of the site, since where the scientific interest is very high nature conservation should be the primary objective, other uses being filled in as appropriate". 59

In its evidence before the inquiry CCS expressed a similar view that scenic and amenity land, especially amenity land suitable for public access and enjoyment near towns, could "go a-begging". The Commission considered that there was not "an adequate range of public bodies able and willing to accept such properties" 60 and that it is "questionable whether voluntary organisations, answerable to a limited membership, are appropriate to hold all the land constituting the national scenic heritage which might become available in the future". 61 CCS thus sought the same power to hold and manage land as available for NCC, and both desired that this should be on the same basis as transfer to the National Trust, national park authorities and local authorities, i.e., free of charge to the recipient. Some such measures do seem necessary to prevent the passing
of land out of the traditional pattern of ownership which these and other bodies have acknowledged as normally sympathetic and responsible, and as having "created" so many of the features it is their responsibility to conserve.

SUMMARY

The conservation groups separate into two distinct classes. The RSPB exemplifies the Nature-oriented resistance to increased recreational use and asserts the absolute priority of its goals over goals of other users of the land. In fact, RSPB denied that nature conservation is a land use and this group was typical of those referred to in Chapter 2 as being concerned to "save" particular features from the effects of man's occupancy of the earth. National control of resources was demanded, with park authorities to be dominated by nature conservation interests having a duty to consider and give priority to goals for nature conservation. Opposition to local control was fundamental because local interests were seen to give priority to recreation and other forms of development. Other conservation groups, both public and private, were less emotive though still critical on some points. These groups saw that working within the developing system rather than in opposition to it was likely to be more fruitful. Here it can be said that RSPB's comments indicated 'reaction' while others, such as NCC, indicated 'response' and attempts to reduce uncertainty in their own environment.
Considerable attention was paid to the National Trust for Scotland because of its major role in providing equivalent reservations to those suggested in the proposal for a Park System. Here the major concern was at the lack of recognition of the role played by private organisation, a deficiency shown not only in some failure to consult about the proposal, but also in the failure of government to provide adequate funds in support of their important role in the conservation of national heritage and amenity.

COMMENTS ON THE PARK SYSTEM PROPOSAL: IV STATUTORY BODIES, GOVERNMENT, AND RELATED ORGANISATIONS

The Central Scotland Water Development Board replied to the Working Group report to the effect that Loch Lomondside appeared to meet special park criteria and, should a park authority be created, the Board would wish to be represented and to have its special interest in and bye-laws for the area considered.

The North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board expressed sympathy with the proposal in 1975 and, following the Working Group's report, the Board wrote to SDD "undertaking to co-operate so far as it lay within the Board's powers". (letter 25/5/78). The Board drew attention to a number of lochs connected to its hydro-electric schemes which might be of significance to the park proposal but on which hydro-electric operations might inhibit some recreational activity. Some importance is attached to its statement that
"for security reasons the Board would generally not be able to sell such ground as they owned in the vicinity of their works to a parks authority and again for operational and security reasons the access of the public to the vicinity of these works might have to be restricted".

However, since the Board generally restricts its acquisition of land to the immediate area of operational facilities, this limitation is not likely to be unduly restrictive. The South of Scotland Electricity Board (SSEB) was concerned mainly with the need to maintain distribution systems for the inhabitants of parks, and felt that the special planning procedure under Section 22 of the Electricity (Supply) Act 1919 would ensure that, where there was sustained objections on amenity grounds, they would be taken into account by the Minister. Section 9 of the Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act 1943 provides a framework for negotiation with local planning authorities, and CCS and the Board therefore opposed the setting up of additional authorities with planning responsibilities specific to parks. This Section and Section 15 and Part I of the first Schedule of the Electricity Reorganisation (Scotland) Act 1954 have been used by the Secretary of State to set up two committees. Proposals for overhead transmission lines and power stations are referred to the "Amenity Committee" and proposals for power stations are also referred to the "Fisheries Committee".

These provisions are supported by the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts 1947-69 and the Town and Country Planning (General Development) (Scotland) Order 1950, the
relevant clauses of which apply to other statutory undertakings, as does Section 66 of the Countryside (Scotland) Act, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

The Scottish Development Department operates through the Countryside Branch of the Planning Division. Little information is available from SDD because of its confidential approach to the proposal for a Park System but some conclusions can be drawn from evidence to inquiries. In its evidence to the Expenditure Committee's inquiry into National Parks and the Countryside, SDD drew attention to the fact that access to the countryside was considered to be satisfactory in 1949 and that this was a major factor in the decision against establishing national parks. SDD was asked whether access was still satisfactory and whether there might now be a need to acquire land to safeguard landscape. The reply was that only a subjective view could be taken, but the little use made of the access provisions of the Act suggested that the position remained satisfactory. No mention was made of the various difficulties that have accompanied attempts to conclude access agreements, or of the facts that the procedure for access agreements did not exist until 1967 and that there had not been the same degree of obligation, on the part of local authorities, to register footpaths in Scotland, an obligation which might have increased their commitment.
to access in general. The most pertinent point, however, is that in Scotland the need was not so much for area-wide access as for access from one point to another from which area-wide access or other recreational opportunities were available. The footpath provisions under the Act did not include some of the advantages of access agreements and, although some linear access agreements were defined (e.g., in the Clyde-Muirshiels Regional Park) this was not the use intended. However, this was the only mutually acceptable way in which ranger services could be provided and payment of "consideration" made in cases where access was needed but area-wide access was not desirable. For this reason one of the major recommendations from local authorities to CCS, notably from Lothian Region arising from its experience in the Pentland Hills, was that the review of legislation should include the ability to make bye-laws and provide ranger services over footpaths, an ability not conferred under the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1894, the relevant section of which would be S2. The relevant clauses of the Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967 are in Sections 30 and 31, whereby a local authority can enter into an agreement, or make an order failing agreement, with any responsible person for creation of a public path. "The created path (may be) subject to limitations or conditions affecting public right of way thereover" but this qualification is not clear and does not provide powers to make bye-laws. No footpath agreements have been concluded, not because the position
was satisfactory on the ground but because the legislation is unsatisfactory.

In December 1975 CCS submitted a memorandum to SDD dealing with the subject of public acquisition of land to safeguard landscape. The SDD view was not given to the Expenditure Committee because of the procedure of ministerial consultation, though clearly SDD would have offered its own advice to the Minister. It can only be assumed that the result of this procedure was not the same flat rejection of the idea as had been given in the discussions of the Ramsay Report and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. Both CCS and the HIDB announced in mid-1978 that they were seeking new or stronger powers to acquire land to carry out their functions, the one to ensure preservation of landscape, the other to ensure proper use of the land. In the meantime the landholding of bodies such as the Forestry Commission and HIDB and the activities of the National Trust and NCC have become sufficiently substantial to warrant some review of the official policy on acquisition.

OTHER STATUTORY BODIES
The Crofters' Commission: Information received from this Commission was confidential. The following observations are publicly available from their comments on the Park System for Scotland made to the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs and the Expenditure Committee.
The Crofters Commission observed in evidence to the Expenditure Committee, that there was a potential for conflict arising with the spread of tourism into the north and west where crofts are an important element of land tenure. There had previously been little conflict but it was felt that, where controversy had occurred, more attention was paid to other interests than to those of the local population. It was seen to be essential that these interests be given more attention in future to comply with the Government's intentions in the Crofting Reform (Scotland) Bill; the Commission was clearly worried that countryside conservation threatened undue constraints on development, particularly where "national" types of park were established. However, the Commission's submission to the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs noted that the peculiarities of crofting tenure and lack of appropriate machinery made coordinated plans for integrated use very difficult (especially between owners and crofters). The particular legalities of recovery of investment "discourage the exercise by the crofter of his statutory right to develop the non-agricultural use of his land". Similarly, the fact that a crofter has no share in the development value of the land he tenants means he has very little to gain from external proposals for development and therefore is likely to oppose them. This procedure is discouraging for landlords and, according to the Commission's evidence, particularly discouraging for developers who "prefer to avoid this (the complicated legal procedure)
particularly if they attach importance to retaining the
good-will of the community in which the development is
to be set up". The result of this is that developers
prefer other land "even though it may not be so suitable
for their purpose and is of better agricultural quality".
From this perspective the Commission's concern at any
other potential restraints on development is understandable.
An interesting point was made to the effect that the com-
plexity of Highland administration, which slows decision
making, does not matter so much in situations where the
main objective should be to damp down development for
conservation reasons, but the reverse is the need in the
crofting lands.

The Crofters Commission gave general support to the
proposal for a park system except in so far as they were
concerned at the implications of ASPCs. These were re-
garded as "fundamentally negative in approach and potent-
ially retrograde as far as local communities and their
economic and social welfare are concerned". The Comm-
ission also specifically supported the recommendation that
regional parks should be controlled by the regional authorit-
ies, and suggested that the 2/3 majority on special park
authorities should be a minimum, particularly if these were
to have the function of local planning authorities.
The Red Deer Commission (RDO) expressed satisfaction with
the proposal. Where the maintenance of a deer population
was contemplated within a park, presumably for tourist
purposes, the Commission indicated that it "would expect to be consulted on the selection of a suitable site and numbers of deer to be maintained" (Correspondence).

The Red Deer is of considerable importance. Stalking is one of the main, if not the most, important source of restriction of free movement for recreation in the uplands. Red Deer range over some 3 million hectares, or approximately 40% of the land area of Scotland, though only about 825,000 ha. is classified as deer forest and most of that carries some sheep. The economic value of shootings is quite high and, though the development potential of an export market in venison is not yet clear, the market is already substantial. Shooting by other nationals is a significant source of foreign currency, probably enough in itself to ensure the survival of stalking even if public access were to become a much more important issue.

The Red Deer Commission was established mainly to deal with the problems of poaching and damage to farming by marauding deer. While compensation may be claimed for damage to crops and grants are available for the erection of protective fencing, RDC considered it "inequitable that the cost of deer fencing should be borne by one only of the interested parties and consider that grant should be made available to deer forest owners for the erection of deer fencing" with certain qualifications. 68
Such a proposal could be highly controversial, given the propensity for rambling interests (in particular) and those concerned with visual amenity, to object to the erection of fencing in open country. If that fencing is to be erected partly at the taxpayers expense for an activity which many regard as privileged, while public funds are severely limited for the improvement or maintenance of accessible land through management agreements, the intensity of the conflict is likely to be accentuated.

In response to questioning from the Select Committee, Lord Arbutnott gave evidence for the RDC that there was an expansion and democratisation of field sports, though little reduction in the expensive nature of activities such as stalking, mainly because it was in short supply. His comment is illuminating because it relates to the social carrying capacity argument about the quality of experience.

"I think it must always be (an expensive pastime) because there is so little of it. It is bound to be exclusive if you practice it in the way it is practised in this country, which is different from any other in that you have one stalking party in a very large area of hills. If you have two, the sport of each is diminished. ..." 69 (emphasis added)

The RDC observed that "over the next 30 years there will almost certainly be a conflict between the use of land for deer and its use for other purposes such as forestry and tourist development. The pressure will undoubtedly be against the deer" 70 (emphasis added).
Competition between rambling and sport may have to be settled by zoning of priority, i.e., allocation of an area to a predominant but not necessarily exclusive use. The practical management difficulties of this did not go unremarked. The spokesman thought that wardened access and management agreements could cope with the amount of competition to be expected in Scotland.

The Highlands and Islands Development Board (HIDB). Comments received from HIDB were confidential apart from the fact that it made a submission on the proposal in 1975 in which it stated that, as most of the special parks were to be in the Highlands, consultation with the Board in the early stages and on a continuing basis was desired. This referred in particular to the working out of the legislation and to the proposals for parks, particularly their boundaries. HIDB indicated that it desired to be represented on any park committee set up to control development in its area.

It is common knowledge that the Board's concern for wise use and proper development of the resources of the Highlands, and its commitment to the Governments' policy of rural depopulation in the Highlands, has led it to support a number of tourist development projects and, recently, to seek stronger powers to enable it to ensure that land is properly developed and managed. As this includes additional ability to acquire land, it is clear that, given the development orientation of HIDB, there is
scope for competition for land between HIDB and CCS and for conflict between their objectives.
The Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) was involved in the Working Group report (1976) and its detailed views on specific aspects can be seen in that report. COSLA's initial comments in the first round of consultations in 1974-75 included the following points:

It agreed that national parks in the internationally accepted sense were not required in Scotland, supported the document's suggestion of a recreational system and agreed that this should take the form of a park system. Such parks should be managed by the appropriate local authority with Exchequer grant to reflect the national interest.

The need for statutory recognition of Regional Parks and for special Park Authorities was conditionally endorsed. In the first case the proviso was that expenditure on management of, and on management agreements in, regional parks should be eligible for countryside grant, as suggested in the Park System document. In the second case, the proviso was that this grant should be at a higher rate without penalty to the Rate Support Grant.

COSLA felt that designation of an ASPC should improve the conservation of particularly significant landscapes.

Designation of country parks should be the responsibility
of regional, general or district planning authorities, and regional parks should be designated by either the first or second. Designation of special parks by the Secretary of State would be acceptable, provided the local authorities were consulted.

COSLA recommended the holding of a wide public debate on the proposal.

The most controversial clause in COSLA's comments read as follows:

"On the understanding that the planning authorities would be consulted on any applications for development within areas occupied by special parks it can be accepted that certain planning functions could be delegated to park authorities."

As noted earlier, COSLA later withdrew this acceptance and the opportunity for planning boards similar to those in the Peak and Lake District National Parks was thereby weakened. This may have strengthened the resolve of CCS to seek powers to acquire land for purposes of conservation of scenic beauty. Clearly, the argument about the powers and composition of Park Authorities which has dogged all proposals since the very first, and which has grown in intensity since the Sandford Report, will be repeated in Scotland with equal vigour.

SUMMARY

The statutory water and electricity organisations were generally concerned with the overlapping of, and
likely effect upon, their functions should a park system be created. There was no sense of opposition but a specific wish to be consulted where they had an interest in a park or any other area likely to be subject to CCS intervention in the procedure for planning control. Although it is clear that the ultimate 'hard bargaining' over the proposal must be carried out between CCS and the Scottish Development Department (SDD), and because it is obvious that SDD is equally as aware as is CCS of the full range and intensity of objection to, and support for, the proposal as indicated by the consultation, it is clear from the Commission's willingness to place on public record its sense of urgency to obtain legislation in support of its goals for both a park system and scenic heritage conservation that the Commission does not expect the outright rejection that the Ramsay Committee's proposals encountered. Nevertheless, it is SDD which has the ultimate responsibility to advise the Secretary of State and to exercise oversight of the local authorities, and there is no intrinsic reason for it to be committed to the proposal. It has been indicated in discussion with officers of the Commission that the delay in implementing the proposal arises within SDD and that the Chairman's recent news releases are part of a consistent effort to speed a commitment to supporting legislation by the Secretary of State.

The Crofters Commission, the Red Deer Commission and the Highland and Islands Development Board all had distinct
reservations about the proposal. Little can be repeated because of the confidential nature of much of the information supplied but it is clear that the main issues were fear of restrictions being placed on development and of conflict over the use of land for the particular purposes of the organisations concerned, and desire to be consulted at all stages of development of the proposal. The last is also a particular concern of the Forestry Commission and it is suggested that the overlapping responsibilities of all these agencies means that the desire for consultation and the antagonism that can arise from a perception that consultation is being neglected can lead to strengthened opposition to proposals to which there may otherwise have been adaptation.

All the organisations discussed desired representation on park authorities (committees or boards) where the park was to include an area relevant to their interests.

COMMENTS ON THE PARK SYSTEM PROPOSAL: V FORESTRY AND FARMING ORGANISATIONS

The Forestry Commission makes a substantial contribution to countryside recreation throughout Great Britain. Its involvement began with the creation of the Argyll Forest Park in 1935. This development was prompted by a perceived need to gain control of wild-camping which was causing management problems and damage. The annual budget for provision for recreation is now £3 million, of which 10%
is allocated to the provision of cabins at the rate of about 30-35 per year. This is a form of provision strongly supported by other agencies, particularly the Scottish Tourist Board. The target for return on capital for recreation is 10 percent and income in 1976-77 was £310,000 (Annual Report and Accounts). The Commission has pioneered a number of activities, notably wayfaring and pony trekking, and the success of these ventures should ensure that a progressive attitude continues. Little difficulty has been found to date in control of the use of forests for motor sports, although charges have recently been increased in accordance with a policy that the cost of repairs to damaged roads should be borne by the agent.

The Commission welcomed the proposal in general terms. An officer of the Policy Co-ordination: Conservation and Recreation Branch said that the Commission had made no points of detail about the proposal but would expect to do this at the time that discussions about the location and boundaries of parks took place. The Commission clearly desired to be involved in such discussions at an early stage, especially where it was a major land-holder. Its statement to the Expenditure Committee expressed a desire for "a significant role in the planning and management of the Regional and Special Parks, and in the designation of Areas of Special Planning Control". Two points are significant here: (1) that application of the ASPC provision outside parks was foreseen; and (2) that Regional
Parks were included in its concern. In regard to the first, the changes in CCS attitude towards the ASPC provision have been noted. In regard to the second, the Forestry Commission considered that regional parks, along with special parks and the ASPC, should be designated by the Secretary of State rather than by local authorities. This indicated some lack of understanding of procedures for designation but an interview suggested that the Commission's comment referred to selection of areas. While CCS took an active role in the promotion of the Pentland's proposal, it appears to have given little attention to suggesting the location of other potential regional parks in its own publications, though such locations have been identified in SDD land use summary Sheet no. 4. The officer agreed that these broadly coincided with forested areas, and expressed doubt about the wisdom of overlapping designations. The Commission considers it has the experience and manpower to manage recreational use of the forests and little is to be gained by overlapping control. The extension of planning control to forestry operations is also opposed for that reason, and because it would be likely to make management more complicated. Similarly, it was thought that a special land use authority would add little except increased bureaucracy.

The Commission considers it has less difficulty in satisfying amenity interests in Scotland than it does in England mainly, it is believed, because conifers are more
traditionally a part of the Scottish landscape. It is admitted that "mistakes were made" in the early days because of the urgency of planting, but it is claimed that greater diversity in the age of forests, their contribution to recreation supply, and the involvement of the Commission's Landscape Architects and consultants, has done much to reduce the criticism.

The Commission is concerned that encouragement of recreation should not disrupt forestry and agriculture as traditional land uses, and that afforestation should not be discouraged. These considerations were emphasised in discussion with an officer of the Commission, but the detail of that discussion and of a number of points of objection made by the Commission during both stages of the consultation are confidential.

The Scottish Woodland Owners Association Limited (SWOA). The Forestry Commission limited its concern about the park system to the production side of forestry on the understanding that the industrial considerations would be dealt with by SWOA in addition to their own comments on production. SWOA recognised the need for designation of areas in which recreation would be dominant, and expressed the hope: (a) that Country Park designation would not prevent the continuance of forestry activities; and (b) that forestry would be able to expand, especially in areas with other designations. SWOA believed that sound forestry operations in popular areas would have educational value,
and looked to active collaboration with park managers and rangers. There was therefore, general agreement with the four-part "system", provided there was "balanced representation" on management authorities. The arrangements proposed by CCS were not regarded as adequate to ensure this balance and SWOA felt that the Forestry Commission's authority would be eroded.

SWOA's position on the composition of park authorities was very similar to that of the Scottish Countryside Activity Council, i.e., that there should be at least 50 percent appointed membership on regional and special parks. This apparently arose from their concern about park management, and specific recommendations were made about extending the principle of management agreements under revised legislation that allowed the considerations, compensation, bye-laws and ranger services applying to "open country" to operate in woodlands through which linear access was provided to open country. SWOA agreed that National Parks were not appropriate to Scotland, not so much because of fear of an explosion of demand, but because of the concern that commercial activities would then not be complementary.

In subsequent comment on the Working Group report, SWOA endorsed the criterion that Special Parks should be established only where "already much used for recreational purposes" and recommended its extension to Regional Parks. Acceptance of the latter could seriously limit the planning
of the system because of the role of the regional park as an area for the development of a broad range of opportunities, not necessarily current, but certainly to be anticipated. SWOA also expressed its reservation about the use of the word "park" because of its connotation of free and permanent access by right.

Comments from other forestry organisations such as the Institute of Foresters of Great Britain and the Royal Scottish Forestry Society were not made at official level, though individual members were involved in other capacities. Comments were not substantially different to those of the Forestry Commission and SWOA.

Farming and Landowners' Organisations - an introduction

Any discussion of the relationship between farming and park system planning - in whatever part of Britain - must be carried out in the light of the Government's policy, outlined in the White Paper "Food from our own Resources". The core of this policy is expansion of home food production in the national interest, with emphasis on efficient use of resources. The sector singled out is the conservation and production of grass for grazing animals and, though the White Paper gave most prominence to increased dairy production, this priority has considerable implication for the upland which contain the bulk of the English and Welsh National Parks, and which dominate the Scottish landscape.
For this reason the White Paper referred to the fears of the agricultural industry that investment and higher output might be prejudiced by pressure for the preservation of scenery, i.e., the "traditional" appearance of the countryside and concluded

"... The projected increases in output ... should not result in any undesirable changes in the environment; the continuing improvement of grazing land and of hill land can contribute to a better looking as well as to a more productive countryside". 75

A second important control is the Common Agricultural Policy of the EEC. This too puts emphasis on technological advance, higher productivity, economies of scale and greater capitalisation, and continues to support reduction of the labour force. Decisions made under the Common Agricultural Policy have potential implications for the structure of British agriculture, especially where, as with other development policies, special grants and concessions are given to "less-favoured" areas. The conflicts between conservation and recreation and agriculture are deepened because both the national and the EEC policy guidelines support not only intensification but also specialisation, trends that carry the risk of increasing monoculture and decreasing variety of landscape elements. Since the farming system is credited with having created much of the "natural beauty" which is the focus of conservation and recreation, its ability to effect quite major changes is very great and recreation and conservation interests show
no sign of being convinced by the statement from the White Paper quoted above.

The National Farmers' Union of Scotland (NFUS) was generally not in favour of the proposal for Park System. Particular opposition was expressed to the English system of national parks, and concern expressed lest they be "imported" into Scotland. The other main concerns of NFUS were: first, restrictions on farm development as a free right of decision by the farmer himself; and second, the likely additional impact of, and conflict with, town-based recreationists if parks were declared. Particular aspects of the first were concern that agriculture and forestry should not be brought under planning control. Planners are seen to be urban in viewpoint, with no real appreciation of agricultural practices or the needs of agricultural communities. It is believed that any need for planning permission would discourage investment, cause unneeded delays, and generate an expanded bureaucracy. It was contended that any expense incurred by farmers because of planning restrictions should be borne by the regional authority, but there is little confidence in the likelihood of satisfactory arrangements for compensation being universally agreed.

Particular aspects of the second concern again included arrangements for compensation; compensation, in this case for payments to farmers within the park system in respect of any damage to their property or business caused by the public being on their land. While some general
principle could possibly be agreed on compensation, two related demands by NFUS are not likely to be acceptable to CCS. These were: (1) that provision must be made for closure of parks to the public during certain times of year such as the lambing season; and (2) that it may be necessary to ban people from countryside parks during the deer stalking season. While arrangements to meet these difficulties might be concluded under management agreements, it is hard to believe that legislation with outright provisions for closures and bans would be passed by parliament.

The farmers' concern about urban attitudes was made clear in their contention that the paramount need was for public education on how to use the countryside, and that all possible effort using all available means should be directed towards such education. In parallel it would be essential to have an adequate ranger service for each park. While few would disagree with the need for rangers, the value of such an education campaign is open to question. Some discussion of this subject, particularly in relation to the "Country Code", is included in Chapter 10.

NFUS' other main points concerned freedom to continue to pasture bulls on open hill in park areas, as well as on low ground fields, and two points about consultation and representation. The first was that there must be full consultation with agricultural interests before an area
was brought into the park system, with everything possible being done to meet farming and landowning requirements and conditions. The second was that farming interests must be adequately represented on any park management authorities.

The Scottish Landowners Federation (SLF) supplied comments to both the original proposal and the report of the Working Group. There were many important similarities between the SLF's position and that adopted by the conservation groups. The Federation agreed with the Commission's assessment that national parks are not appropriate to Scotland and strongly opposed both "special" and "park" as names, while agreeing that the principle of the special park was valid. SLF supported the conservation priority but mainly from the perspective of support for traditional rural industries. There was a strong distrust of dominance of special park authorities by local planning authorities. The Federation considered that there should be a majority of nominees by the Secretary of State who should also appoint the chairman. In addition to its support for national control, SLF strongly advocated a national ranger service to operate over the whole area of regional and special parks, supported by suitable by-laws.

The Federation's view on management agreements is difficult to rationalise. It was insisted that these should be freely negotiated and that any suggestion of compulsion would be counter-productive. However, a
spokesman for SLF accepted that there should be a right for the owner or occupier to require the park authority to negotiate an agreement. This raises the issue of compensation, which SLF considered should be paid on an annual basis for any loss of production and for any additional costs incurred. Clearly this issue will, as in the national parks in England and Wales, provide one of the most difficult areas for negotiation at both the legislative stage and the stage of identification and specification of individual parks.

The other major point made by SLF was that local park committees should have a majority (special parks) or at least 50 percent (regional parks) of members who were owners or occupiers of land within the park.

The SLF position stresses the importance of maintaining and supporting the full-time productive population of the Highlands as the first priority. The fact that most depopulation over the long term has been due to displacement or migration of agricultural workers is acknowledged and the first signs that this trend has been arrested are welcomed. The combination of forestry and agriculture is seen as the most likely way to revitalise the upland rural economy and the present financial policies for re-afforestation as the most serious obstacles to successful diversification. While satisfactory for institutional and private investors on a large scale the policies do not
encourage the small investor, e.g., the hill farmer who might desire to put a portion of his land under forest.

A spokesman for the Federation confirmed that, in addition to ranger services and bye-laws, management agreements covering the whole of the parks will be essential. He did not see a need for any additional compulsory powers to secure agreements, it being suggested that even the existing powers are not likely to be needed if patience and sympathetic negotiation are practised. There is a dislike for negotiating under pressure, such as the threat of use of compulsory procedures, as can be seen from the SLF comments on the NCC paper "Nature Conservation and Agriculture" where it was observed that

"The bludgeon of legislation could be the worst way of controlling the finer details of land management... Legislation only encourages adherence to the letter of the Law and not the spirit. Since the owner would seek advice as to the minimum required, more stringent legislation would soon be needed, ---". 76

The Federation supported the Countryside Commission's desire for amending legislation to permit rangers to operate over public footpaths both within and peripheral to parks. Considerable attention was paid to the need for the Countryside Commission, either directly or through the park authority, to exercise some supervisory role over development on the fringe of parks, and it was considered that the staff and ability to operate at this level of responsibility would require an immediate injection of
Among the other comments of the Federation perhaps the most controversial was the reference to "inevitable blight" during the negotiation for the establishment of regional and special parks. Noting the slow progress made with access agreements, SLF suggested that financial compensation should be available, i.e., compensation related to the difficulty in selling property or obtaining permission for development.

The Hill Farming Research Organisation (HFRO) had reservations about the effects of designation of parks on upland farming and farming communities. Much of their concern stemmed from their experience in the Pentland Hills.

The Scottish Association of Young Farmers Clubs (SAYFC) supported the proposal in principle. Special reference was made to management agreements because of their relevance to compensation for loss of production and, by implication, SAYFC saw major value in these agreements if they contributed to a "better partnership and relationship between agriculture and forestry".

Despite its increasing proportion of urban resident members, SAYFC, in its evidence to the Expenditure Committee, cast a jaundiced eye on urban residents, labelling them as increasingly "aggressive", "uneducated" and "untrained in the use of the countryside". The importance of education was emphasised and attention drawn to the
need for greater expenditure on it. SAYFC agreed there must be "planning for a proper provision for the majority" given as a matter of urgency, such planning to include proper consultation, providing "an opportunity to be represented when decisions of policy and implementation are taken." 77

Agricultural Advisory Services in Scotland are provided through the three Agricultural Colleges (which are grant aided by DAPS) rather than directly through the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) as is the case in England.

The Colleges' advisory role is not statutory as is that of the Agricultural Development and Advisory Service of MAFF and, strictly speaking, it is to advise on technical agriculture. The Socio-Economic Advisory Service, with one advisor for each college region, was set up under EEC Directive No. 161. The Director of the East of Scotland College sees socio-economic advice as a growing role, but the timescale of growth as unpredictable. The prime needs are to raise the appropriate questions so as to promote discussion among the farmers, and to sponsor a wider scientific and public debate on why more access is necessary and why there is a need for better integration of agriculture and forestry. The problem is that development along these lines involves many new ideas which have first to be researched, then developed on a working basis and then demonstrated. 78
One of the major problems in improving the relationship between urban and rural interests is seen to be the changing economic circumstances of the farming industry, which have reduced the numbers of farm workers. Two long-term problems resulting are the ageing of the agricultural population and the decline in shepherding. Both reflect comparatively low returns and low wages from agriculture. The first can lead to decline in farm management in general, the second to loss of ability to carry out maintenance of farm buildings, walls etc. Hill and upland farmers are generally more conservative about investment than lowland farmers, a conservatism which appears to be accentuated by age. This has three manifestations: (1) a general shortage of capital for new investment; (2) unwillingness to incur debts and desire to hold any surplus; and (3) tendency to use excess capacity if available rather than to develop new capacity. The advisory services give general support for the Park System because it could provide a vehicle for additional economic benefit, particularly in more remote farming areas, and supplement the existing sources of grant or loan. The usual approach for such funds is first to the Scottish Tourist Board and then to the Small Industries Division of the Scottish Development Agency.

SUMMARY

The Forestry and Farming Organisations varied in their response to the proposal. The major issue of concern to
the Forestry Commission was mentioned in the summary to the section on government organisations, namely, that full consultation should be carried out at all stages, and that the Commission should be represented on park committees where a park contained a forestry interest. SWOA's concerns were very similar to those of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors and, but for the desire to keep organisations with a direct concern with primary production together, it could have been considered with that group in which the management of land within parks and related designations was the major issue.

There was some trenchant opposition to the proposal from the National Farmers Union for Scotland (NFUS), mainly because of antagonism to national parks and the experiences of farmers in England and Wales. (It can be suggested, however, that many of the inadequacies of the English system were a direct result of the objections which determined the structure of the national park legislation). A second major issue addressed by NFUS was also regarded as important by the Scottish Landowners Federation. This concerned the arrangements for compensation for loss of production occasioned by the need, under planning restrictions or conservation guidelines, to forgo improvement of the land or other capital investments and, similarly, the compensation to be paid for damage resulting from recreational use of the land. Some clearly unacceptable demands for restrictions on access were made by NFUS and, in this
context, the detailed consideration by the SLF of the voluntary nature of management agreements and the severe problems experienced in concluding comparable access agreements under the existing legislation, do not augur well for a park system which will so obviously and heavily depend on management agreements. This dependence results from the acceptance by CCS of the position forced upon them in previous consultations, i.e., the presumption against national parks in substantial public ownership. Because management agreements are seen as so essential to the successful operation of the system, particularly in regional and special parks, the next chapter includes a discussion of some of the issues related to agreements in the context of the proposed Pentland Hills Regional Park. Here, however, it is suggested that the Countryside Commission for Scotland's renewed determination to obtain powers to purchase amenity land as it becomes available and to hold and to manage land (as shown in its submission to the Inquiry into the National Land Fund and in recent news releases) suggests that the Commission is fully aware of the problem of obtaining management agreements, is not sanguine that the new legislation will bring a substantial improvement (because it is a conflict over rights as much as over responsibilities), and sees the necessary control as most satisfactorily obtained by public ownership of the most valuable areas and of those other areas necessary to support the Commission's objectives for recreation and conservation short of full public control of all land in the parks.
There are three ways in which the establishment of the proposed park system could be approached. The first approach is that a recreation system already exists and the park system is a formalisation of it. The purpose under such an approach would be to obtain control of the system so as to ensure the minimum disturbance to prevailing values.

The second approach is to accept that establishment of parks is a positive means of modifying demand, and to use the park system to change the structure and distribution of recreation activity. This approach was not much in evidence in comments on the system, probably because its proposers gave less emphasis to the potential of the park system to provide a wide range of benefits in addition to control, and a majority of commentators desired low intensity, informal use.

The third approach is to accept that there is a dynamic relationship between parks and recreation and that not only will parks modify demand, as above, but that parks will change as demand changes. This is a more realistic view, but is even less in evidence, probably because most of those who commented do not like to envisage that the park system might not provide formal and predictable patterns of use and management.
The commentators on the whole appeared to desire that park authorities should adopt the first approach, working within the pattern of demand already existing to exercise control of its impact on the 'environment'. This essentially normative approach allows the creation of a system with a specifiable degree of internal differentiation consistent with existing social policy. However, because social policy tends to find its form around sets of issues, when new issues arise, as they must, changes in social policy are inevitable. Since the normative approach tends to focus on design processes and the making of plans, there is an increasing danger that conflict will develop as plans become less relevant to developing issues.

The standard response to increasing conflict has been to seek greater control, but this simple and coercive approach, because it attempts to fit the new element into the existing pattern with minimum disturbance, has the result that an increasing series of poorly-integrated provisions may be made until the new force becomes dominant in the planning process. The growth of access to the countryside by private car followed this course. Cars have now been accepted as an integral part of the recreation system, but the piecemeal provision which resulted from the failure to recognise the effect of increasing car ownership, not only on access but also on the total pattern of use of leisure, has reduced the options for response to other unpredicted demands, such as that for wilderness. The
failure was that the goals of the car-borne visitor have not been understood and the planners have been unable to model the system to account for goals rather than identifiable behaviour.

The author's view is that the test of a system is whether the ability to meet goals is increasing. So far as park systems are concerned, this means whether the carrying capacity of the countryside as a whole has increased, as it must do while population and leisure both increase. An increase in carrying capacity as the prime goal for a park system is not synonymous with improving the opportunities for enjoyment of the countryside.

The difference may not be obvious because the two goals merge. For the most part, however, improvement of opportunities for enjoyment of the countryside is a matter of providing additional access to supplement existing patterns of use and facilities for newly-released demand (either additional people or novel activities). It is rather mechanistic, the concentration being on adding parts to the system so as to create sufficient redundancy of parts to be able to take restrictive action and redirect demand when necessary. On the other hand, the goal of carrying capacity involves arrangement of the parts of a park system so as to increase flexibility while affording sustained high-quality experience at intensities consistent with justifiable psychological, sociological and economic
criteria. This is a more vital approach which is difficult to state in simple terms. Essentially, what is meant is that, rather than supplementing an existing pattern, an attempt would be made to develop a new pattern where the maximum flexibility was maintained in as many parts as possible. "Flexibility" implies opportunity to change the use being made of an area by either increasing or decreasing the number of activities that can be performed. This would enable changes to be made in the purpose of a site, or even of a whole park, to increase the capacity of the system as a whole. Changing one part of a system effectively changes the system itself because the arrangement of its parts is thereby different.

B. EVALUATION OF COMMENTS ON COMPOSITION OF PARK AUTHORITIES

Most organisations commented on the composition of Special Park Authorities, but almost all attention was on the proportion of local government representatives to nominees of the Secretary of State, or on their own interest being represented on authorities. While for the most part a separate issue, there is an underlying principle which was raised as early as the Ramsay Report of 1974 in which the recommendations included park planning committees that would consist of two-thirds representatives of local planning authorities and one third appointed by the National Parks Commission. This was accompanied by another recommendation that the National Parks Commission
should appoint a local committee for each park whose main function would be to advise the Commission on the development of the park, although it would be delegated some (unspecified) functions related to establishment and maintenance. The park planning committee was to be entrusted with all the relevant responsibilities under the Town and Country Planning Acts, especially in regard to development control and the preparation of a development plan for the area of the park, but overall planning responsibility was, it appears, expected to be with the National Parks Commission and the Secretary of State.

The Ramsay Committee was far from specific about how the National Parks Commission would operate in relation to the park planning authorities, but clearly thought that it would have overall direction, would require a substantial independence, and should have its own staff for the operation and management of the national parks. The Commission was to be involved in both planning and management, and to have responsibility for the publicly owned land of the Parks (though this land would be vested in the Secretary of State). It was, therefore, recommended that the Commissioners "should be selected for their administrative capacity and knowledge or experience of the matters involved in the development and management of National Parks and not as representatives of particular interests". The latter could be represented on the local committee but these should include not only local interests but also other users of the park and it was not
suggested that such 'particular interests' be represented on the Park Planning Committee.

The Countryside Commission of Scotland has not been so specific about these matters in its document on the Park System. While it seems very likely that CCS does have specific proposals, these have not been made public. Thus, in view of the large number of organisations which have stated a wish to be represented on the planning committees of special and regional parks, it is likely that CCS will have some difficulty if it proposes that these interests be restricted to an advisory role, i.e., that the Secretary of State should make his share of appointments to the Special Park Committees (which will be the planning and management committees under the present proposal) on the basis of recommendation by CCS of individuals selected for their knowledge and experience of park management. The emphasis is placed on the word "park" to distinguish this as an important principle, namely, that whereas a park committee would have no difficulty in going outside its own membership for specialist advisors on matters related to other land uses, it should have in its own structure the expert knowledge of the matters which are specifically the goals of the park system and no other system or type of land management. These matters are countryside recreation and conservation of the recreation resource. Implied expertise, as interpreted by the author, includes practitioners in fields which are related to human
concern - perhaps "social ecology" is an appropriate
term - which often seem to be poorly represented on
park authorities. The obvious examples include leisure
sociologists, environmental psychologists, landscape
artists, and specialists in the planning of recreation
systems, as well, perhaps, as recreation geographers if
not represented amongst the latter. It seems futile to
lament the conflict between recreation and conservation,
yet not to incorporate in the first level of decision-
making those who can contribute most to an understanding
of the causes of conflict in support of those whose expert-
ise is, for example, the ecological effects of recreation,
or legal and administrative basis for the control of conflict.

C. OTHER IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONSULTATION PROCEDURE

In Chapter 9 of its proposal for a Park System CCS
noted that it had the benefit of limited consultation on
the earlier paper submitted to the Select Committee on Land
Resource Use in Scotland and that the 1974 proposal took
account of the advice received. It has been shown that
this "taking account", together with adjustments to the
comments on the 1973 discussion paper, resulted in a major
reduction in the emphasis on national parks to the extent
of abandoning the adjective "national" in favour of "spec-
ial". This may have lowered the objection to the impli-
cation that the land within the parks would be "national-
ised", but it accentuated the fears that large numbers of
unsympathetic visitors would be attracted. It is suggested
here that, while it was both possible and politically desirable for CCS to appear to eschew national ownership of the parks, it was not possible for them to devalue national significance for recreation. This obviously carried the risk that in the subsequent, and likewise limited, rounds of consultation there would be stronger criticism of the proposal by conservation interests.

As the comments showed, satisfaction of both sides would have necessitated relinquishment of both "national" and "park" from the title, something the Commission probably could not do without renouncing its recreational responsibilities, and risking defeat on these grounds when the proposal comes before Parliament.

The effect of the consultations has been to reduce the uncertainty about the grounds on which the proposal would be attacked at the critical legislative stage. CCS has good reason to believe that some form of the proposal will eventually go before Parliament. It probably would be politically inexpedient for the administration to reject it in the same way as the Ramsay Report's proposals. Earlier exposure to wider public comment may have been a realistic option, but the Commission has been able to ensure that most of the likely objections, and hence most of the uncertainty, has been removed from the decision-making process. This means that there is less likelihood that the whole legislative 'package' will be held up, or even rejected, because of unanticipated objections against which there are no readily available
defensive arguments.

The limitation of consultation seems likely, however, to have two other consequences:

(1) reduction of options; and
(2) postponement of conflict.

In regard to the first point, the risk is that the final proposal will have been so adjusted to the known objections that it will offer no significant advantage over already existing options for the achievement of the same results. In this case the amount of popular support for more radical concepts (which, e.g., the Ramblers' Association considered necessary) could not be tested, and the proposal will be open to the accusation that all it does is add another element of bureaucracy. In regard to the second point, if it is accepted that the perceived need for a Park System results from competition for resources - an increasing demand for recreational use "threatening" other uses such as agriculture, conservation and private shooting - the structural solution to the problem should aim to satisfy all the components of the problem, of which the main ones are:

(1) conservation of scenery and wildlife;
(2) protection of the authority of the landowner and the livelihood of the farmer; and
(3) opportunities for activity in the countryside by an ever increasing proportion of the urban population.

There is a danger that the park system will be so tightly tied to the first two that inadequate steps will be taken towards the third. A balance between urban and rural
interests, based on due consideration of the extent and continued growth or urbanisation, is required. Short of much more positive attempts to reverse the process of urbanisation, which seems totally improbable, increasing recreational demands on the countryside are inevitable. Such demands reflect a dependence on natural resources that is intensive, varied and strongly competitive. It is suggested here that this already has resulted in revision of conservation priorities and will continue to do so.

Selznick (1949) has stated that

"whatever the ultimate national implications of its choices the organisation in action must deal primarily with those who are immediately and directly affected by its intervention".

In parks in Great Britain the immediate effect is not upon the wider public for whom a new park or comprehensively planned park system would provide substantial recreation and amenity benefits, but on the other agencies and departments of Government at various levels, and the established and organised owners and users of the land, i.e., those who were consulted. It is these groups with which it is necessary to develop smooth working relationships and avoid a continuing atmosphere of crisis and conflict. Likewise it is these groups which are most likely to obtain representation on planning and advisory committees as they did in the case of the English and Welsh National Parks and the Pentland Hills Regional Park. The pressure that some groups were able to exert to have their own interests
given priority in development of a regional park in the Pentland Hills, the consultation procedure, and the attempts being made by the responsible authority to reduce the frustration and disorganisation arising from incessant conflict, are the subject of the following chapter.
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CHAPTER 9: THE PROPOSAL FOR A REGIONAL PARK IN THE PENTLAND HILLS

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The Pentland Hills adjoin the built-up area of the city of Edinburgh and their northern slopes lie partly within the city boundary. Hill sheep farming is the main agricultural practice, supported by some hill cattle and, on the lower slopes, dairying and cultivation. Several other types of land use are important, notably water supply for the city and surrounding settlements, agricultural research, military training and field sports (mainly the shooting of grouse). The land is mainly clothed in pasture and heather moor, with many belts and a few larger patches of woodland on the lower slopes. The hills provide an extremely important landscape and recreational resource for the population of Lothian Region, forming a spine extending for about twenty miles to the south-west of Edinburgh. This spine is crossed by eight rights-of-way running generally north-west to south-east, several other de-facto routes which either cross the hills or connect the rights of way, and a very important path which runs roughly along the line of the spine over the crests of many of the individual hills. Most of these routes, together with the places referred to in the following text, are shown on the published map enclosed at back of this volume. Recreational use of the area is mainly for hill walking and, on the lower,
more gentle slopes in the vicinity of the reservoirs, for casual strolling, picnics and similar informal activities. The amount of use has increased in parallel with both the growth in the population of the region and the general increase in demand for countryside recreation of the past two decades.

As was noted in Chapter 5, the Pentland Hills have long been an area in which conflicts between recreation and other uses of the land, and attempts to restrict public access have occurred, but apart from the rights-of-way, now almost exclusively used for recreation, little recreational development has taken place. There are, however, two public parks at the northern end of the hills, one of which (Hillend) has an artificial ski slope. Between these parks lie two tracts of land, one of which is subject to a conservation agreement with the National Trust for Scotland, the purpose of which is to conserve its landscape by ensuring that the land is not cultivated and is maintained for grazing. The other tract at Dreghorn is owned by the Ministry of Defence and is used for training with live ammunition and for "dry" training exercises, and its future use is probably the single most critical issue where the future pattern of recreational activity in the hills is concerned.

There was considerable controversy over this range before the second World War, and a period of comparative
inactivity after 1945 was terminated by the Army's decision in the late 1960s to bring the range back into use. As the spread of Edinburgh's housing had extended towards the range there was renewed public concern which was duplicated in the newly-formed Countryside Commission for Scotland and led to a move to achieve some new arrangements to ensure that the use of the area was consistent with its position and with its ability to serve the recreational needs of the population of Edinburgh. The course taken by these moves is outlined below. The most important incident has been the proposal to declare a regional park which, although it was in advance of any substantial consultation on the Commission's developing idea of a park system for Scotland, clearly bears an important relationship to that system as now conceived. Many of the problems that might be expected to accompany attempts to establish the components of the system following legislation have already arisen over this proposal for the Pentland Hills.

The author selected the Pentland Hills area as a case study for several reasons including:

(1) the proposal for a regional park had recently been announced;

(2) the responsible authority was willing to make information on the proposal available during the course of its development;

(3) the comprehensive background provided by a previously completed report on the area, and the adoption of this report as a basis for
implementation of the proposal, suggested that fairly rapid progress would be made;

(4) an advisory committee was established on which most of the groups likely to have strong views on the proposal were represented; and

(5) the area was conveniently located.

The responsible authority was the Lothian Regional Council through the Countryside Division of its Recreation and Leisure Department; this body hereafter is referred to as "the Department". An attempt was made to gain an understanding of the issues which arose, and a particular interest was taken in the attempt by the Department to identify the problems for which statements of policy were, or would become, necessary and for which plans would need to be developed. The main problems and issues were:

(1) the structure of the park administration, particularly the balance of local authority membership on both the (political) park Committee and the (official) planning committee;

(2) the boundary of the park, particularly (a) whether, the boundary having been adopted following designation of the area of a preliminary study as an Area of Special Planning Control (ASPC), the bounding roads should be considered to be within the park; (b) whether the boundaries should be adjusted to include other adjacent recreational resources and to provide a link to the township of Penicuik, and (c) whether small parts of the urban areas of Edinburgh and Balerno, or the portions of the area lying within other local authority regions,
should be excluded;

(3) the priority to be given to different uses of the land in the park, particularly whether military training could be considered consistent with other purposes for the area;

(4) the appropriateness of various recreational activities in a regional park setting and the ability of the park to support them, particularly in respect to the location of country parks and other places suitable for more extensive use;

(5) the availability and possibility of improvement of access to and within the park, particularly (a) the amount of accommodation to be given to the private motorist, (b) the effect of development of the proposed south-city bypass on access to the proposed country park, (c) the formalisation of de-facto footpaths and conclusion of access agreements, and (d) the development of new paths, particularly "round routes";

(6) the procedure for development control;

(7) the basis and schedule for development of a management plan, particularly (a) the information needed on the resources of the park area, the present use for recreation and the opinions of the visitors, and the problems, needs and opinions of the landowners and their various tenants, and (b) the possibility of rationalisation of the extremely complex pattern of landownership in the area; and

(8) the procedures to be adopted for public consultation and the role to be played by advisory groups.
There was considerable overlap between many of these issues.

Although the author investigated at least some aspects of each problem in considerable detail, only one is discussed at any length here, for two main reasons; firstly, the lack of the necessary space to give an adequate account and, secondly, the fact that owing to slow progress with the proposal, beyond the author's control, it is not possible to arrive at any substantial conclusions on most points. It was decided therefore that the arguments of the preceding Chapters would be most suitably supported by a discussion of some points related to:

the conflict with the various interests in the area covered by the proposal and the attempts by the Department to consult with, and adjust to, these interests while maintaining its twofold concern to improve opportunities for public enjoyment of the area and to conserve its natural beauty.

The method adopted has been to interpolate comment at what have seemed to be appropriate points in an account firstly of the origins of the proposal for a regional park in the Pentland Hills and, secondly of the attempts to bring it to fruition.

9.2 ORIGINS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR A REGIONAL PARK

The proposal for a regional park in the Pentland Hills was made fully public by the newly established
Lothian Regional Council in mid-1975. The Director of Physical Planning supported the proposal by referring to the recommendation to this effect in the report entitled "Pentland Hills Conservation and Recreation" published in September 1972 by the Pentland Hills Technical Group. ¹

The meeting (5th March, 1970) from which the Pentland Hills Technical Group arose was called by the Scottish Development Department (SDD) and chaired by Mr. R.F. Butler, (Assistant Secretary, Planning Division) at the instigation of the (then) Assistant Director of the Countryside Commission for Scotland, Mr. T. Huxley. Although the meeting was ostensibly called to discuss the recreational needs of Edinburgh, Mr. Huxley's purpose was to obtain some positive project for the Pentland Hills area and to establish a presence for CCS in the area. ² SDD had not been in favour because there had not been overt conflict and it did not want to be involved in arguments over firing ranges and military training, but it agreed to the meeting under pressure from Mr. Huxley. At the meeting, attended by SDD and CCS and also by Midlothian County Council and Edinburgh Corporation, Huxley suggested there had been sufficient conflict to justify detailed investigation.

Part of the problem in the Pentland Hills was that there were some unnecessary restrictions to access,
particularly on the part of water authorities which had erected signposts threatening penalties on areas which only affected compensation reservoirs. Also the decision by the Army in 1969 to reopen the Dreghorn firing range while another range at Castlelaw, also in the Pentland Hills, was reconstructed had focused public attention on the effects of military training in the area. The study "Open Space Plan for Edinburgh", prepared by the city's planning department in 1969, had recommended that a country park be established in the Pentland Hills, and it was felt that thorough study of this suggestion was needed. The representatives of Edinburgh Corporation pointed out that the Pentland Hills was only one of the areas referred to in that plan and that they foresaw no further (i.e., additional) threats to access. Nor were they sure how facilities for organised sport would fit into a country park. The latter was a particular reference to the facilities for dry skiing at Hillend. Despite these reservations, the Corporation agreed that a study to determine what needs existed would be valuable. Midlothian County Council (hereafter called "Midlothian") agreed that a working party was necessary and that its task should be to draw up a conservation and recreation plan for the Pentlands.

Emphasis is given to that definition of the task because of its importance to subsequent events. The addition of conservation to the remit of the working group was suggested by the Depute County Clerk, Mr. Ritchie.
According to Huxley, Ritchie had a very good feeling for the attitude of the landowners which moved him to suggest that an emphasis on conservation rather than simply on recreation was important. Ritchie was the driving force for the work of the Technical Group (see below), much of which was done by Midlothian. Edinburgh Corporation took a less active role, judging the Pentlands to be less a city problem, even though the Northern Slopes area lies within the city boundary. Huxley's opinion is that it is regrettable that Ritchie "disappeared from the scene" in the local government re-organisation in 1975. He was one of three personalities who was to play a critical role in the first stages of the proposal. (The first was Huxley, who worked to get the Technical Group established, chaired its meetings, and used his influence to try to have the report implemented; the second was Ritchie, who, in addition to the above-mentioned roles, kept the issue alive in the local authorities up until reorganisation; the third was Mr. Tindall who, as Director of Physical Planning for Lothian Region following reorganisation, took the proposal through the Region's committees and made the public announcement).

Having agreed to set up a working party (subsequently called Technical Group), the meeting suggested that it should consider the following topics for the northern half of the Pentland Hills:

(a) a review of natural history and historical resources;
(b) the adequacy of existing facilities (e.g., car parks, footpaths, refreshments);
(c) potential conflicts between recreational, water, grazing and military uses;
(d) the relevance of ranger services to the above conflicts; and
(e) consultation with the Ministry of Defence on future use of firing ranges.

It was suggested that the Planning Departments should provide the basic information and any necessary surveys might be conducted by youth organisations so as not to require consultants though consultants were in fact used). Other sources of information such as the Scottish Wildlife Trust were identified. A decision was made not to publicise the working party particularly because it was thought desirable not to prejudice the investigation of other possible sites for Country Parks. The target date for the group's report was December 1970, i.e., nine months from the initial meeting. The working party proper first met on 7th April and the name "Pentland Hills Technical Group" (PHTG) was adopted.

SDD was not represented on the group, though it provided a secretary and facilities for its meetings and agreed to provide advice on eligibility for grant for any facilities it might recommend. After the first meeting, Midlothian began compilation of maps showing land ownership, geology, topography, climate, drainage, access roads, and a land use classification. It produced a base map of the area in time for the second
meeting on which the study area had been extended to take in most of the Pentland Hills, i.e., almost twice the original area. Because a small part administered by Lanark County Council was now included it was invited to participate but only two of the later meetings were attended by its representative.

At the second meeting note was taken of the Recreation Survey of Greater Edinburgh being carried out by the Department of Geography at Edinburgh University and Mr. Duffield was invited to join the group as an advisor. Subsequently, the group was extended to include Mr. E. Holdaway, originally in an advisory capacity from the Department of Urban Design and Regional Planning, later as a temporary, CCS funded, member of the Midlothian team. Holdaway prepared the first draft of the group's report, and Huxley wrote the final version.

The terms of reference adopted at the first meeting were:

"To consider the conservation of the Pentland Hills and the need for the provision of facilities in relation to them in the light of the Countryside (Scotland) Act, 1967, and to indicate how the many important interests in their development and conservation can be interrelated." 4

The report was not to be binding on the local authorities or CCS, and it was assumed that it would be given wide public consideration.

The procedure of the Technical Group was to be:
(a) consultation with bodies with a particular interest by inviting representatives to successive meetings to give information relevant to the terms of reference.

(b) following this first round of consultations, to produce (by autumn) an interim report and preliminary recommendations.

(c) following receipt of reactions, to prepare a final report.

and it was to be able to extend its concern beyond the study area for particular purposes.

That emphasis on consultation from the very start is significant in view of subsequent persistent claims that there had been no proper consultation with the landowning interests in particular. It was decided that the Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT) and the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC) should be invited to the second meeting (7th May) and the Scottish Landowners Federation (SLF) and local Agricultural Executive Committee to the third (2nd June), to which the National Farmers' Union (NFUS) was subsequently also invited. The fourth meeting (1st July) was attended by the Lothians River Purification Board (LRPB) and the South East Scotland Water Board (SESWB).

At the second meeting SWT (which had been founded six years previously in 1964, and now had 700 members in the Lothian Region) advised that its main aim was to conserve wild life and habitats and its main interest in the Pentland Hills was Balerno Common where it was negotiating
a reserve. These negotiations proved to be very complicated because of the difficulty in identifying and contacting all those holding common rights, and the reserve was later to prove a major constraint on planning in the Thriepmuir area. SWT presented a report on the vegetation of the Pentland Hills and undertook to present information on the fauna, including a list of birds and their breeding grounds.

The NCC presented a map of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (4) and areas of wildfowl interest (5). There are no areas in the Pentlands of National Nature Reserve status over which NCC could exercise more stringent control than offered by identified SSSIs. For this reason it had been decided not to publicise one site containing a rare saxifrage (Saxifraga hirculus) by giving it SSSI status. NCC undertook to provide further information and later identified areas of botanical and geological interest. It was considered that the educational use of the area should lie mainly in the latter. Consultation with SWT and NCC continued during the drafting of the report.

At the third meeting the Lothians Agricultural Executive Committee stated that they favoured the study and, drawing attention to the particular problems at lambing time, asked for measures to control dogs. NFUS repeated both these remarks, referred to well-
meaning people moving livestock they thought had strayed from the flock or herd and mentioned danger from broken glass, particularly to working dogs. The need for areas in which townspeople could exercise their dogs was noted, as were the practical problems that might arise in them. SLF also supported the study and the need for more areas of land with free access, but again with strict control over dogs.

Other issues raised at that meeting included constraints on grazing in catchment areas of reservoirs supplying potable water (the group was informed that livestock grazing in these areas was generally acceptable and that the main objection was to people); the integration of forestry and agriculture; the need for hardwoods to be preserved for amenity and wildlife despite their uneconomic nature; and problems associated with horse riding.

The emphasis on consultation continued. SLF, NFUS and the Agricultural Executive Committee agreed to submit statements about how their interests might be affected by the Group’s terms of reference, and it accepted their recommendation that contact be made with individual owners, especially in the Balerno and West Linton areas. At the subsequent meeting two letters were discussed, the first to be sent to owners and the second to interested organisations.
Also at that meeting the Group received representation from water and reservoir interests. The South East Scotland Water Board approved the terms of reference and recognised the need for freer public access, but it saw possibilities of pollution and damage because of the number of spring sources protected only by fire-clay pots. These sources were not close to existing rights of way but greater general access might lead to difficulties. The matter of prohibitive notices and their wording was raised, in the light of the admission that the only sustainable restriction was on bathing in reservoirs. This issue has yet to be resolved, despite persistent attempts to standardise signs and remove unnecessary restrictions. The Lothian Rivers Purification Board discussed possible restrictions necessary to ensure "high water quality", and potential problems of sewage disposal from developments which would require the Board's approval. The Board agreed to forward a written statement of its interest. (The issue of water supply should have become less difficult with local government reorganisation because it was made a regional function but many of the difficulties remained).

Consultation continued with the distribution of 55 letters to owners, of whom 22 replied. Six of these replies required detailed responses from PHTG, though the Group declined to discuss questions about proposals it might have in mind to make. Such proposals were
discussed at the fifth meeting but it was not thought possible to suggest specific developments until survey work was completed and the draft report prepared. A similar letter was sent to 27 groups, 9 of which responded. Later another was sent to the Ministry of Defence because the firing ranges were still an important issue. The appointment of the Nugent Committee on Defence Lands was publicised at the third conference on "The Countryside in 1970" in October of that year, and members of the Technical Group were aware that this Committee, which was appointed on 14th January, 1971 would necessarily consider the Pentland ranges.

Suggestions that the area should be a regional park and that the Dreghorn range should be included in a future Country Park were well entrenched by August 1970. At its next meeting the group decided that detailed action plans for parts of the area might facilitate the discussion of planning proposals. Midlothian agreed to submit suggestions. Meanwhile, a draft report on the information already gathered was prepared and this was discussed at a meeting in November 1970. Huxley had begun editing, and the committee did not meet again until February 1971. The second draft was discussed in detail in March and the cost and circulation of the report became an issue from the meeting in April. It was decided that all owners would receive a free copy from CCS and that approximately 100 copies would be reserved for consulted
interest groups. Other copies would be available for sale.

In view of the claims from 1975 on that there was not adequate consultation, it is noted that at the April meeting Hewitson (Edinburgh Corporation) suggested that local amenity groups should soon be consulted. Huxley advised that he had been doing this informally for some time. The Group also sent a further letter of information to the landowners.

By December 1971, the draft report was complete and amended. Although this was one year after the original target, good progress had nevertheless been made considering the resources available for its compilation. Eighteen copies were made available for consultation and selected bodies were invited to submit observations, except on Chapter 9 which contained the proposals. This chapter was to receive further consideration by the Group. At a meeting in February 1972 the comments on the first eight chapters were noted for incorporation, along with the amended Chapter 9, in a final draft to be drawn up by CCS and used for consultation. The work of the Technical Group was now virtually complete. The final report was published in September, 1972. It was widely circulated and received considerable publicity. The next task was to have it adopted by the local authorities which, as the introduction to the report stated, were not committed by it.
This account of the work of the Pentland Hills Technical Group has been included to set the scene for subsequent events. The three points to make are that the group arose because of concern about the need to safeguard recreational opportunities in the Pentland Hills area; that it immediately increased the scope of its inquiry to include the conservation of the Pentland Hills; and that it carried out comprehensive consultation with landowners and farmers, with other users of the resources of the hills and with amenity interests. Furthermore, although this was not mentioned in the account above, Duffield and an associate undertook for the Group a study of the recreational resources of the hills and their use, including a survey of traffic and parking, which complemented studies in adjacent Lanarkshire and Edinburgh. The results of these studies were incorporated in the Group's report which provided a substantial background to its recommendations. These recommendations included consideration of the area for designation as a regional park because of the need for integrated resource and recreation management; the designation of a country park on the northern slopes overlooking Edinburgh; and special attention to four other localities already experiencing significant recreation pressures, namely, the Plotterstone-Glencorse, Thriepmuir-Harlaw, West Linton-Badinegill, and Harperrig areas. It is necessary to consider now the delay between completion of the report in 1972 and its adoption in 1975.
9.3 ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE PENTLAND HILLS
TECHNICAL GROUP

Several factors made it difficult for the local authorities to become committed to the Technical Group's report:

(1) delay while further consultation was undertaken;
(2) the impending reorganisation of local government;
(3) the announcement of the proposal for a Park System for Scotland; and
(4) problems in securing a country park on the northern slopes of the hills.

A certain amount of time was essential for consultation before Midlothian County Council and Edinburgh Corporation could press on with the report's recommendations. Despite later claims to the contrary, there were several meetings with farmers, and Huxley addressed meetings of NFUS and SLF. The initiative mainly had to come from the counties, and local government reorganisation was approaching. There was in fact an overlap before the regional and district councils took effect, during which time both they and the old counties were meeting. During this period the counties were not permitted to undertake new capital commitments without the approval of the new authorities, though continuing programmes were expected to be implemented. Ritchie was to retire from Midlothian at the changeover and there was nobody with a comparable interest in the two new districts,
Midlothian and West Lothian. Thus, although CCS did much to get Midlothian County to accept commitment before changeover, and Tindall, the Director of Physical Planning for the incoming Regional Authority, had put the report and its proposal for a regional park before his own committee before changeover, the counties did not commit themselves and there was no running programme when the regional authority took over. The main achievement was the approval of the park proposal by appropriate committees of Lothian Region, and the acceptance by the Secretary of State for Scotland of the recommendation that the Pentland Hills area be declared an Area of Special Planning Control.

The local authorities would have been aware of the suggestions made in the proposal for a Park System for Scotland, including the fact that legal support was required for regional parks. The lack of legal status was used as an argument by those opposed to the proposal to support their claim that the term "park" should not be used, though this argument was more forcefully made after the proposal was taken up, and most of the delay seems to have been due to reorganisation.

Although there was no general adoption of the report before reorganisation, there was some progress towards an application for country park status for the northern slopes. This was, however, immeasurably complicated by
the Army's firing range. The subject of the Pentland ranges came before the Defence Lands Committee (the Nugent inquiry) which met in Edinburgh, inspected the ranges, received written evidence and subsequently heard oral evidence, notably from Edinburgh Corporation, SDD and CCS as representing government interests, from the Cockburn Association and the Pentlands Action Group representing amenity interests, and the Scottish National Rifle Association and East of Scotland Rifle Club representing the interest of public use of range facilities. This committee noted the ambitions for a country park on the northern slopes, but recommended that the Dreghorn range be retained, though live firing should cease and the range area should be used only for "dry training". There was some conflict here with the Countryside Commission for Scotland's criterion that country parks should be in unified management, but the committee clearly felt that the use of its area for military training and public recreation could co-exist and recommended that

"the Ministry of Defence should negotiate a formal agreement with Edinburgh Corporation to enable the latter to develop Dreghorn, on a long-term basis, for public recreational purposes, compatible with the military dry training requirements". 5


Edinburgh Corporation, together with Midlothian and CCS subsequently agreed to invite selected consultants
to prepare a report and plans for a country park. A design brief was prepared by CCS in August 1974 and discussed at a meeting on 20th September. In December Tindall advised the incoming Planning and Development Committee that, on the City Planning Officer's recommendation, three firms of Landscape Architects would be commissioned for an "Ideas Study" at an agreed fee. While he thought that it would not materialise until after May (official changeover was to be in May 1975) the study was never undertaken. By November 1975 the difficulty in achieving any progress until all firing ceased at Dreghorn had led the Director of Recreation and Leisure to suggest that, as an interim measure, the Council should establish smaller country parks, in two heavily-used areas, Hillend and Bonaly, which could be united eventually.

The long delay in achieving clearance of Dreghorn - the Nugent Committee understood that "the project could be completed by 1974/75" - has many causes. Not the least of these was the small but vocal opposition to reactivation of the Castilelaw Range, and by mid-1978 the matter was so far from resolution that the Secretary of State agreed to a study by an independent consultant and to a local public inquiry. The reference to this controversy is included here to demonstrate how other issues have delayed implementation of the proposal for a regional park. There can be little doubt that both
a regional and a country park will eventually be established, but the very long delay is indicative of the problems associated with the complicated land use and tenure pattern in the Pentland Hills area.

9.4 THE PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CONFLICTS

Following the changeover to the new system of local government, Tindall called a press conference, followed by a meeting of the farmers and landowners, at both of which he announced that the Pentland Hills would become a regional park. He had assumed that consultations had been undertaken and, as staff were soon to be employed within the Recreation and Leisure Department and the backing had been given by proclamation of the ASPC, no doubt it was reasonable to assume that the recommendations of the report had been accepted. The farmers and landowners thought otherwise and much of their opposition has been intransigent since that meeting. Several have stated that no co-operation will be offered while the word 'park' is current, their reaction being based on fear of loss of control and authority and the suspicion that they will be told how to manage their land. They use words such as "take-over" and the much-dreaded term "nationalisation". They form a powerful group of opponents to the proposal, and are sometimes joined by others. Most important of these are some of the conservation groups, of whom the most
vocal are the Pentlands Action Group, whose original reason for existence was to mount opposition to the proposals for the Castlelaw Firing Range at the time of the hearings by the Nugent Committee. This group has remained in existence because the ranges are still a major issue in the Pentlands and has extended its concern to general opposition to any change within the Pentlands. Some of its most outspoken members are also members of a local amenity group called the A702 Society which, like the Pentlands Action Group, is represented on the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee (see below).

Following the public announcement of the proposal there was a meeting between some councillors and Directors of Departments of Lothian Regional Council and representatives of the Scottish Landowners Federation and the National Farmers Union of Scotland. One result of this meeting was the sending of a letter to all the affected landowners in the area of the proposed park. This letter contained further information about the proposal and notice of meetings at which it would be discussed. These meetings were marked by a hostility which continues to the present. In a complementary move to counteract the claims that there had been no consultation the Department established the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee.

9.5 THE PENTLAND HILLS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lothian Regional Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh District Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark District Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian District Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Commission for Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Sports Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Landowners Federation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Farmers Union of Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Tenants Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Landowner interests</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Land Agents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Centre for Rural Economy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust for Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh University, Tourism and Recreation Research Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Rights-of-Way Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentland Action Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A702 Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Guides Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Horse Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents associations and community councils</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor education advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Anglers Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The establishment of this committee is, in fact, consistent with the Department's policy of forming consultative committees. The Pentland Hills project is the responsibility of the Countryside Division (one of four within the Department), although the ski slope at Hillend is the responsibility of the Sport and Physical Recreation Division. There is a general advisory committee for the Countryside Division in addition to the special committee for the Pentland Hills, and a considerable overlap in membership of agricultural, conservation, amenity and activity interests, together with representation from the Forestry Commission and the Countryside Commission for Scotland and all the local authorities in the Region. The Department has sought the views of as many established groups as possible (see Table 9.1). The terms of reference of the committee are to advise on developments, to consider the best way to implement the Technical Group's proposals and to recommend measures for the conservation of the hills and integration of the various interests. It has, however, tried to operate as the controller of the whole planning and development process, something which is the role of the elected Recreation and Leisure Committee of the Regional Council. In effect, the Advisory Committee is unwieldy and obstructive. The Region's staff feel they have gone out of their way to accommodate the desires of its most vocal members and that the Committee has delayed them in the performance of their duties.
One of the most protracted arguments has centred on the demand by some members of the committee - the most influential interest groups - that the Department should produce a management plan before undertaking any action at all in the area. This is not possible because the Region has a statutory duty to ensure adequate provision for recreation and it is not in a position to ignore deficiencies and problems until a management plan is produced; nor is it possible to have a management plan until negotiations have been completed with the various interests about purchase or management agreements over areas of land. The Department's response was to prepare a "concept plan" and, subsequently, a set of management proposals based on the recommendations in the Report of the Technical Group, which it accepted as a basis for planning in the area, continually asserting that the Advisory Committee had done the same.

The term "concept plan" has been used by Beaman and Lehtiniemi to describe a plan which "outlines in general terms where the park will be located, something about its size, the features to be highlighted, and the type of development to be undertaken". 7 Because the Committee was demanding what is in effect a "master" plan, its request was not well received. The Department's next response, as mentioned above, was to attempt to obtain acceptance in principle by the Committee of its proposal to concentrate on the publicly-
owned area in which it proposed to develop a country park, and the areas identified in the Pentland Hills Technical Group report as 'Areas for Special Consideration', with the addition of one other (the Water of Leith). The Department proposed to the Committee that it would develop more detailed "Locality Schemes" for two of these areas, in co-operation with the owners and tenants of the land. The "locality schemes" were related firstly to a broad classification of the area into three zones on the basis of intensity of use and possible development and, secondly, to a number of nodes around which activity was based. This led to a set of general management guidelines by which, for each zone, there was specification of which activities would be either (a) promoted, (b) not promoted, (c) discouraged, or (d) banned from those areas, together with a restatement of the management principles on which the park would operate. These were: maintenance of agriculture as the dominant land use over most of the park; conservation of landscape, flora and fauna, and natural amenity; and control over recreational impact by systematic provision of appropriate facilities in appropriate locations. The Department obtained an acceptance in principle of this set of guidelines from the Committee and has since attempted to counter criticism by the claim that it is working within these guidelines.

The demand by members of the Pentland Hills Advisory
Committee for the production of a detailed management plan before any action was taken to provide facilities or in any other way to change the pattern of recreational opportunities, showed a lack of appreciation of the purpose of a management plan. The attitude of regional officers was that it is not possible to conceive a management plan to relate to an area over which no substantial management control is possible and/or in the absence of formal agreements (or at least agreements in principle) with the owners of the land. As has been shown in previous chapters, public ownership of regional or national parks has proven unobtainable. The completion of management agreements has been almost as difficult. After three years of concerted effort by the Department substantial progress has been made towards only one such agreement and the opposition of farmers and landowners remains, on the whole, as intransigent as when the first public announcement of the proposal for the park was made.

9.6 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES

Because of the intransigence on the part of the landowners and farmers with support from the sporting interests, and because some of the amenity groups, (particularly the Pentlands Action Group) are regarded as obstructionist and disruptive, the staff of the Department consider that the Committee is not performing its proper advisory role. This has led to a critical
review of future procedures for consultation and public participation, and to new proposals for the structure of planning and management authorities for the park area between now and designation, and subsequent to designation.

These discussions have included consideration, almost from the inception of the proposal, of the appropriate composition of a Regional Park Committee. The consensus of opinion is that this Committee should be political and comprise representatives of each of the local authorities affected (Lothian, Borders and Strathclyde Regions and Midlothian, West Lothian and Edinburgh Districts), with the chairmanship and casting vote lying with Lothian Region. This Committee would be directly responsible to the Recreation and Leisure Committee of Lothian Region. The detail of park planning would be the responsibility of a Park Planning Committee consisting of officials of each of the local authorities. One interesting issue related to this Committee structure concerns the reluctance of the Recreation and Leisure Department to approve representation from both the Planning and Recreation Departments of the other authorities because of the size of the Committee that would result. The present proposal is that the Director of Administration of each District Council be asked to make this delicate decision between Departments.

The operation of the park would be the responsibility
of a working committee comprising staff of the Recreation and Leisure Department of Lothian Region, with the ability to seek advice from other local or national authorities as necessary. The consultative committee would be substantially curtailed on the grounds that it has attempted to exercise control. This process has already begun with two measures: firstly, the setting up of a "Rural Land Management Group", consisting of representatives of farming, forestry and landowning interests, including (in various capacities) the Army, Edinburgh Centre for Rural Economy and the Countryside Commission for Scotland; and, secondly, the transfer of regular discussion of Pentland Hills affairs to the Countryside Advisory Committee, with reduction in the frequency of meetings of the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee to twice yearly. It is proposed that, following designation when supporting legislation is enacted, one of these meetings will be a full public forum.

Pending this legislation, establishment of the Regional Park Committee of politicians seems unlikely.

The Technical Group had noted that there would be misgivings about the concept of a Pentland Hills Regional Park, particularly by landowners (including public landowners), and it singled out the fears raised by use of the word 'park'. In the event both the amenity and landed interests demanded that all reference to the "regional park" cease and that the area be referred to
simply as "The Pentland Hills". The Department made considerable concessions but refused to abandon the term completely, mainly because of the effect on morale and its determination that recreational interests should be supported.

9.7 THE DETERMINATION OF RECREATIONAL INTEREST

This support for recreational interests, and the need for a factual basis for the "locality schemes" that would assist in their justification to the Advisory Committee, led to some surveys of visits and activity patterns in the two localities for which schemes were being prepared. These surveys were supervised and, in the case of activity patterns, conducted by the author, who also processed the results. Because considerable interest was attached to the type of information the Department would seek in order to assist in planning and in support of its goals, the author did not determine the content of the questionnaire, although he gave assistance in its design. The results which the Department chose to report to the Advisory Committee are included in an appendix to this chapter. That report was prepared by the author for the Department and presented, with minor editing, by the park director.

It is not proposed to discuss the results presented, or the additional information available, except to record, firstly, that the latter showed that the places of origin
of visitors to the park were very unevenly distributed, with areas of Edinburgh of lower 'social status' being almost totally unrepresented and, secondly, that the pattern of activities and the balance of preferences were not identical with those that had been assumed by the members of the Advisory Committee and on which they based their objections to development. These points are considered by the author to have considerable significance to the argument that interest groups have attempted to force changes in the proposal that are not in the wider public interest.

With regard to the first point, the uneven distribution of visitors, it is suggested that the results of the survey did not indicate recreational need but rather the opinions and behaviour of those able to gain access to the countryside. Even so, there was little to suggest that a substantial majority of these visitors acted upon motivation towards experiences consistent with the higher levels of need of the Maslow hierarchy, and this is supported by consideration of the second of the above points.

The opponents of the proposal asserted that the Pentland Hills area was one in which, through hillwalking and rambling, the visitor would find recreation as an observer of a different way of life, of natural history and scenery, and as a recipient of peace. For this
reason all change other than a possible increase in the number of footpaths was to be resisted, particularly if it appeared likely to lead to an increase in the number of visitors to the area. In fact, as the surveys showed, there was a very low proportion of active hill-walking and most visitors confined their activities to quite short routes along roads where the terrain required no particular exertion on the part of the walker, surfaces were hard and dry, and density of use often quite high. In response to questions about their desire for changes more than 50 percent referred to some desirable improvement mainly associated with car parking (19%), or improvements to the footpath network (13%), and this was not seen by them to be inconsistent with the general attraction of the area due to its peace and quiet, scenery, countryside atmosphere and convenience or proximity to their homes.

The conclusion to be drawn from these points is that the Advisory Committee failed not only to give consideration to the potential contribution of the Pentland Hills to the recreational needs of the region as a whole but also to fully represent the opinions and needs of the existing users.

One further issue was studied in considerable detail because of its critical role for the whole pattern of recreational development in the park. This was the
issue of the military firing ranges and its importance is that removal of the range from Dreghorn is essential to the plan for the Northern Slopes Country Park on which the present policy hinges. The problem is not to convince the Army to move for this has long been its intention, but rather it is to obtain agreement about the site for an alternative range. Because the Army owns such a site, at Castilelaw, it has proposed redevelopment there, but this site is very close to Flotterstone-Glencorse, one of the areas selected for locality plan studies because of its existing heavy use. There has, as a result, been very strong objection to the proposal for Castilelaw and, responding to public pressure and a request from the relevant local planning authority, the Secretary of State has commissioned a consultant to investigate alternative sites and has ordered a local public inquiry to follow submission of the report. Alternative sites already have been investigated, on two occasions (during the Nugent Committee hearings and again in 1976/7) but none proved satisfactory to the Army. The continuation of this issue is of particular interest because it places the Department in the invidious situation of having to support the proposal for Castilelaw if a choice must be made between it and Dreghorn, while the majority of Advisory Committee members representing conservation and amenity groups (but not all community groups) are opposed to this order of priorities. This is another of the many issues in which the Advisory Committee took a very local and sectional view rather
than a systematic view of the park as a whole. Unfortunately, like so many other issues, it has not yet been resolved and only limited discussion is possible. The public inquiry in this case would have given much additional and valuable insight on the views of the different parties to the conflict.

9.8 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The Pentland Hills Advisory Committee has very broad terms of reference which permit it to advise and comment on almost any aspect of local government activity concerned with countryside in the area of the Pentland Hills. It has, however, attempted throughout (with a few exceptions) to take an issue-oriented stance and so has provoked the resistance of council officials because of its obstructive rather than co-operatively advisory role. The most common complaint of the Department's officials was that the Committee sought to vote on matters of detail rather than advise on matters of subject. The detail of proposals is the proper sphere of the district planning authorities, which are themselves represented on the Advisory Committee, and district planning procedures provide opportunities for objections. Many problems arose because representatives of more powerful bodies on the Committee, particularly the Scottish Landowners Federation and sporting tenants, had personal interests in the area which they perceived to be threatened by the whole concept of what the Committee was set up to advise upon.
They therefore adopted an antagonistic role which contravened the purpose of the committee, disrupted its proceedings and has led to a set of proposals for reorganisation of consultation procedures which effectively reduces the ability of some other members of the committee to provide regular advice. This is unlikely to cause much concern to the Department because those members rarely offered advice under the old arrangements and most are in any event represented on the Countryside Advisory Committee which also received reports related to the Pentland Hills. The interests whose advisory role has declined through this reorganisation are mainly those associated with recreation and local residential matters. The major bodies which might be expected to carry forward their interests, namely the Sports Council on the one hand and District Councils on the other, are not involved in the small consultative groups designed to meet if necessary on a more frequent basis, though the local authorities will be involved if the current proposal to develop a local plan to cover the Pentland Hills Regional Park area - however redefined - is implemented, i.e., when planning at this level of detail begins. It is unlikely that much progress will be made towards the local plan until the Regional Authority considers that the country park and locality schemes are making satisfactory progress.

It proved very difficult to relate decisions reached
in Advisory Committee meetings to coherent goals of the member organisations, a problem recognised by the Assistant Director (Countryside Division) of the Department of Recreation and Leisure (Mr. Langmuir). The size of the Committees and their domination by the most vocal opponents of the Regional Council and/or its park proposal, meant that other members tended to speak only on particular issues which affected them directly, and not on the broader issue of recreation policy.

This increased the emphasis on protection in committee proceedings, whereas the Council and its officials wished it to adopt a real advisory role on how to make progress. Langmuir attempted to bring the goals of each body out into the open by having them give statements of interest as the first item of general business at each meeting. In fact, almost all reported on their actions rather than on the values that underlay those actions and on the way those values influenced their decisions in, or contributions to, the Advisory Committee. This meant that the committee very often agreed in its "advice" on the next step to be taken by the Department without the underlying reasons being examined. This became a problem when the result of the action was examined in the light of those concealed values, because it was then that the issues became most specific. Under these circumstances there was a tendency for some committee members to deny that they had agreed to the action at all because the effect was not what they imagined it would be.
The most outstanding example of this was the adoption of the Pentland Hills Technical Group's Report. As previously recorded, initial hostility arose from the assumption by the Director of Physical Planning on his accession that, because the report had been widely circulated and discussed during its compilation, it was accepted as a basis on which to proceed. Thereafter the Council, and the Director Designate of the park in particular, were most anxious that progress should be based on some fundamental agreed principles. For this purpose the report was analysed carefully by the staff of the Countryside Division and recommended by them to the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee as providing a reasonable basis. The Committee was asked to approve the principle of attention being concentrated on the northern slopes and the four other main pressure points identified (Thriepmuir-Harlaw, Harperrig, Flotterstone-Glencorse, and West Linton-Baddinsgill), with the addition of one other (the Water of Leith). The Committee agreed and the staff proceeded to develop policies and to plan action to improve and control recreation at these locations. When the staff presented a related set of objectives and strategies, several members of the Committee first objected that the Department was moving too fast and then, when it was suggested they had agreed to the basis for the planning, denied that this was the sort of measure they had expected. It became clear that these groups wanted recreation to be controlled but were
unprepared for the developments necessary to exercise that control because their real values were that there should be no change in the landscape and land surface. This negative approach was frustrating for the Department which had set up the Committee to provide advice on the best way of exercising its responsibility to provide for the recreational needs of the residents of the Region. This responsibility so patently involved planning for use of the Pentland Hills that the fundamental opposition was never accepted as representing anything but sectional interest. It was felt that if the goals of other committee members were better known, the opponents might take them into account and modify their opposition, but this did not prove to be the case. At this point further reference is made to the matter of the "Concept Plan", (see p. 447) in order to argue that some of the most serious conflicts over the proposals for a regional park have occurred, and will continue to occur, because of misconceptions held and errors of judgment made at this early stage. The most serious misconception in the Pentland Hills case was the assumption by members of the Advisory Committee that designation of a Park should be based on detailed criteria of design and management rather than on general principles and negotiable options. The most serious error of judgment was made by the Region, firstly in establishing such a large committee with such a heavy representation of narrow vested interests, and secondly in not limiting the Committee to the giving of specialist advice, thereby
permitting it to demand detail planning before agreement had been reached on general principles. The best option available to the Region once it was caught in this situation was probably the one it took, i.e., to bypass the Committee for advice and reduce the frequency of its meetings while preparing to have it reconstituted with its terms of reference redefined.

As noted on p. 447 Beaman and Lehtiniemi referred to a concept plan as one which outlines in general terms the location, size, features to be highlighted and the type of development to be undertaken in a park. In their discussion of Federal - Provincial negotiations for acquisition of parkland in Canada, they observed that an economic impact study to evaluate the viability of implementing a proposal for a new park is normally commissioned only when the concept plan is well advanced. Formal negotiations continue, using the economic impact study "to determine if, or on what basis, a park proposal should move beyond the concept plan stage". They drew attention to the likelihood that decisions and compromises made during these negotiations will modify some aspects of the original concept plan. If, as a result of these negotiations, agreement is obtained and the park is established, the process of detailed planning can begin, and Beaman and Lehtiniemi noted that there is "no mechanism to ensure that the final design of a park adheres closely to the concept plan on the basis of which the park was judged to be viable".
There are some important principles and object lessons, relevant to Advisory Committees such as that for the Pentland Hills, which may be drawn from these observations.

The point was made earlier that the concept plan should be limited to considerations such as location, size, purpose and type of development to be undertaken in the park. If the comments of Beaman and Lehtiniemi are applied to the Advisory Committee process as it has developed in Lothian Region and the scope of an impact study is broadened to include 'environmental' as well as economic criteria, suggestions can be made for more effective operation in the planning system.

The role of an Advisory Committee could then be systematically developed by stages in parallel with the evolution of the park proposal. Its first role would be to give advice related to the concept of the park. At this stage amendments to the concept plan are not inappropriate, but advice should be related to issues and not to detail more appropriate to master planning. At the next stage the general economic and environmental impact study may be commissioned, but again not at the level of detail needed for master planning. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that it was in its premature concern with detail that the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee failed. The need for objectivity is particularly important at this stage and, given it, an Advisory Committee should prove
a highly appropriate body to assist with:

(1) identification of the economic and environmental criteria requiring analysis;
(2) expert advice on the estimation or measurement of potential impacts; and
(3) evaluation of the impact study.

As was noted (p.461) Beaman and Lehtiniemi identified a weakness in the procedure in Canada in that, during the bilateral negotiations between the Provincial and Federal Governments which follow an impact study, there is a tendency to make modifications which depart from the original concept plan. They suggest that evaluation of the development of a park is difficult if the concept plan has been 'extensively transformed' at this stage. They recommend the identification of 'critical indicators' by which to evaluate modifications to the concept plan. Where significant departures were revealed by these indicators pressure could be applied to keep the development on the right 'trajectory', i.e., to ensure that the expectations for the park that had been expressed in the concept plan were realised. Attention is drawn to the similarity between these 'critical indicators' and the 'thresholds' of conflict which were identified in Chapter 6 as being levels beyond which remedial action would be necessary because carrying capacity was exceeded. In the present case, the critical indicator could identify the extent of change in a plan which would prompt conflict over goals.
The implication for the planning of components of the Park System for Scotland is not hard to see. In the first place, the objectives of a park, both as an entity in itself and as an element of the developing system, should be clearly and categorically stated. If as seems likely, all parks with national or regional status have an advisory committee, it should be a primary duty of each committee to question any modifications to the concept plan that depart from these fundamental objectives. In the second place, assuming that the planning in the early stages does in fact consider the proposed park as part of a system, there must automatically be an evaluation of the probable impact of the park. It would not be surprising if such an evaluation led to changes in the concept plan. It would, however, be a fundamental error if these changes were not specified. Given that this is done and the decision is made to proceed with the proposed park, an advisory committee is an appropriate body to ensure that the results of the negotiations which take place between the park authority and other agencies, groups and individuals, are consistent with the concept plan as finally conceived.

Following agreement and the subsequent dedication or registration of a park, the processes of design and development proceed and the role of advisory committees should change. If, as might be expected, a master plan (or "management" plan) is now undertaken, an advisory committee should:
(a) provide technical advice in the construction of the plan;
(b) consider how closely the final design of the park adheres to the concept plan;
(c) advise on priority and staging of developments set out in the plan; and
(d) review the development procedure for its conformity with the master plan and the original concept plan.

It is suggested that it is at this stage of a park development programme, i.e., planning in detail and implementation, that an Advisory Committee has a proper concern with detail of the type the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee sought to consider in the early stages of the proposal.

In conclusion, it appears that the conflict engendered by the circumstances of the announcement of the proposal for a regional park in the Pentland Hills, and the polarisation of opinion which extended throughout the subsequent consultation procedure, had some immediate if not permanent effects on the recreational environment of the Lothian region and on the carrying capacity of the Pentland Hills. The most important factor may have been that the Advisory Committee provided those hostile to designation of the park with a forum for their protests and with some ability to delay the implementation of the proposal by:

(1) requiring the collection of detailed information irrelevant to the immediate
purpose (e.g., a survey of the plant communities of the whole area);

(2) continually denying that points had previously been agreed, or adding new conditions; and

(3) questioning points of detail that were the proper responsibility of other parts of the planning system.

This conflict of interests, by delaying the implementation of proposals, has meant, firstly, that the recreation-related problems which gave rise to the Pentland Hills Technical Group are, after ten years, little nearer to control, let alone elimination; secondly, that the improvement to recreation opportunities for the population of the region which is the goal of the regional authority has not been possible; and, thirdly, that a critically important element of the proposed Park System for Scotland has been so delayed in its development that reasonable doubts can be expressed about the designation of other elements and the synthesis of the complete system.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AONB</td>
<td>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRS</td>
<td>Association for Preservation of Rural Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPC</td>
<td>Area of Special Planning Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>Countryside Commission for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSLA</td>
<td>Convention of Scottish Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE</td>
<td>Council for Protection of Rural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDB</td>
<td>Highlands and Islands Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>Nature Conservancy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFUS</td>
<td>National Farmers Union of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNR</td>
<td>National Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDA</td>
<td>National Park Direction Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>National Trust for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAG</td>
<td>Pentland Hills Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTG</td>
<td>Pentland Hills Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>Red Deer Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICS</td>
<td>Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPB</td>
<td>Royal Society for Protection of Birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPI</td>
<td>Royal Town Planning Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAYFC</td>
<td>Scottish Association of Young Farmers' Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAC</td>
<td>Scottish Countryside Activities Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDD</td>
<td>Scottish Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF</td>
<td>Scottish Landowners' Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STB</td>
<td>Scottish Tourist Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOA</td>
<td>Scottish Woodland Owners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>Scottish Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPA</td>
<td>Town and Country Planning Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 9

Included in this appendix are a transcript of the survey and questionnaire form, and the report of the results in the form in which they appeared in the annual report to the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee.

When asking the question at item 9 on the questionnaire, the interviewers showed a map on which 79 key points were identified. The route taken was recorded by listing any of these points in the order in which they were passed. The questions at items 10 and 11 were not prompted (e.g., no suggestions were made as to what types of improvement were being contemplated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY AND QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY OF WEEK</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. GROUP SIZE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. WHERE HAVE YOU COME FROM TODAY? (SUBURB)

3. HOW DID YOU GET HERE? CAR BICYCLE WALK OTHER (SPECIFY)

4. AT WHAT TIME DID YOU ARRIVE IN THE PENTLANDS TODAY?

5. (NOTE TIME OF DEPARTURE)

6. (CALCULATE LENGTH OF STAY)

7. ARE YOU A LOCAL RESIDENT OR ON HOLIDAY IN THE REGION?

8. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU BEEN HERE (SINCE JAN. 1) THIS YEAR?

   0  1  2-5  5+

9. COULD YOU TELL(SHOW)ME (LIST) WHERE YOU HAVE BEEN?

10. WHAT IS IT THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THIS PLACE? (LIST)

11. ARE THERE ANY THINGS THAT YOU DON'T LIKE ABOUT THIS AREA OR CHANGES THAT WOULD IMPROVE IT FOR YOU?
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A survey of visitors was conducted in the summer of 1977. The Department of Recreation and Leisure sought to establish the levels of use at Flotterstone/ Glencorse and Threipmuir.

In the framing and administration of the questionnaire, every attempt was made to avoid leading questions. No prompts were given in regard either to the attributes of the localities or improvements which might be under consideration. The survey was limited to the Flotterstone and Threipmuir locality plan areas. No interviews were conducted at the proposed Country Park area. It was not possible to assess the opinions of those who do not visit Flotterstone and Threipmuir.

The questionnaire was kept as simple as possible. It was designed to provide the following prime items of information:

A. VISITOR PROFILE
   1. The size, age and sex composition of visitor groups.
   2. Group origin and method of travel to the Pentland Hills
   3. Proportion of visitors who are residents of Lothian Region.

B. RECREATION PATTERNS
   1. Time of arrival and departure and length of stay.
   2. Crude frequency of visits.
   3. Locations within the area visited on the trip.

C. VISITOR ATTITUDES
   1. Main attractive features of the area.
   2. Main unattractive features of the area.
   3. Main improvements desired by the visitors.

This information serves two important and continuing purposes - (1) as a supplement to the findings of the Pentland Hills Technical Group and improvement of the data base for park and locality plans; (2) as a datum against which any changes in use or attitudes following the implementation of locality plans can be assessed.

Methods

A pilot survey of 25 groups was conducted at Flotterstone. After modification of/
of the two final questions, the survey was conducted at four sites - Flotterstone, Kirk Road, Threipmuir and Harlaw. A total of 772 complete interviews was obtained.

The interviewers approached groups of visitors as they left the sites. Interview points were:

Flotterstone - at the roadside beyond the entrance to the Flotterstone Inn car park;
Kirk Road - at the gated entry into the field;
Harlaw - at the gate adjacent to the Water Keeper's cottage;
Threipmuir - at the car parking area east of the Scottish Wildlife Trust reserve and, when possible, at the road junction to the west.

Results

1. Details of Group and Individual Numbers Interviewed - Table 1
2. Proportion of Visitors in Four Age Groups (%age) - Table 2
3. Size of Groups (%age) - Table 3
4. Method of Travel - Table 4
5. Length of Stay (%age of Groups) - Table 5
6. Frequency of Previous Visits (%age) - Table 6
7. Distance Walked (Kilometres) - Table 7
8. Pattern of Walking Routes (%age of Groups) - Table 8

These tables form the appendix to this report.

Discussion

1. Nature of the Groups

Four age groups were selected and the members of each interviewed group allocated to them by estimation. There is a remarkable uniformity in the number in each group at both Flotterstone and Threipmuir. At Kirk Road and Harlaw the number in the 45 and over age group was much reduced. This may be explained by the nature of the terrain at Kirk Road, but no explanation is readily apparent for Harlaw. Females over 45 outnumbered males at Flotterstone and Threipmuir, but not at the other two sites. If there are deterrent factors at Kirk Road and Harlaw, it is possible that they cause a greater reduction in female than in male participation. At Harlaw there was a slightly higher demand for car access to be improved. The larger number of visitors who walk in to Harlaw suggests that car access may be the problem which deters the older group and women over 45 in particular.

There was no significant difference in the total number of males compared with/
with females except at the Kirk Road, where groups consisted of 20% more males than females. Because the highest proportion of groups which included children visited Kirk Road, it is suggested that this area may be more attractive for father + children groups.

2. Duration and Frequency of Visits

Approximately three quarters of all groups stayed at the sites for a period of two hours or less. Only 6 - 7% of visits lasted four hours or more. Most groups stayed from 1 to 2 hours at all sites except Threipmuir where 41% stayed one hour or less and only 27% between 1 and 2 hours. This compares with 20 - 30% for shorter and 42 - 50% for longer stays at the three other sites and correlates with the higher number of short walks at Threipmuir than at Flotterstone and Harlaw. The high proportion of short walks at Kirk Road is due to its greater use for general access compared with the use of footpaths at other sites.

At Harlaw the greatest majority of groups appear to be regular visitors. Here much more use is made of round walks. Round walks are well used when, as at Harlaw, their availability is obvious. Studies at Flotterstone have shown that very few visitors are aware of any round walks suitable for the preferred distance and time of 3 - 4 km and 1 - 2 hours respectively. These results suggest a high potential use for round walks of this type at all sites, but particularly at Flotterstone and Threipmuir.

3. Access and Car Parking

Between 80 and 87% of visitors reached the four localities by private car. The restricted amount of parking clearly limits the use of Harlaw and the Kirk Road. However, fifteen or more vehicles were counted at the latter site on numerous occasions. At peak use time (usually Sunday afternoon) car numbers several times reached as high as 70 at Flotterstone and 60 at Threipmuir. This is approximately 75% higher than Duffield and Owen's 1970 counts at Flotterstone and 100% increase at Threipmuir. On one extreme occasion there were 97 cars parked in the Threipmuir area. Recreation activity in the Threipmuir area appears to have increased more rapidly than at Flotterstone.

4. Attitudes Towards Management and Development

Responses to the two final questions were grouped under a number of general headings. The most common responses to the question, "What is it you like about this place?" are listed below:

peace and quiet
scenery
convenience/proximity
fresh air/pollution-free
pleasant countryside
nice and easy walking

Despite the high proportion of visitors from nearby residential areas, "convenience" or "proximity" had relatively low scores. This is particularly evident at Threipmuir where this response ranked seventh behind those shown in the list and "interest in natural history", which covers such practices as bird-watching. This response also ranked sixth at Harlaw and was moderately/
moderately important at Flotterstone as was "freedom from traffic". The responses grouped under "pleasant countryside" were distinguished from those under "scenery" because the former related to the "atmosphere" of the area, the satisfaction obtained from being in a "nice place" and "enjoying the countryside", in contrast to simple appreciation of the visual landscape. Freedom from traffic was most important at Flotterstone (15% of respondents) where there also is most opposition to the existing use of access roads.

Very few respondents raised specific points of objection other than to cars on the roads, as mentioned, and to the presence of obtrusive signs indicating restrictions - notably Water Supply and Army Firing Range notices. Many groups indicated desire for improvements in car parking, route marking and in the surface, variety and extent of the network of footpaths. There was a demand for toilets, seats and benches and picnic sites. The size of this response does not indicate the extent of potential use of such facilities, because nothing is known about the effect of their absence as a deterrent to regular visits.

The responses, coupled with observations of such factors as congestion at car parks and wear and tear on footpaths, pointed to the need to improve facilities and ranger-operated services at the access points, particularly Flotterstone and Threipmuir. The additional observations and informal interviews carried out over the past two years further support the proposal to provide opportunities for informal activities such as picnicking as well as more short round routes at the access points. Diversification at these places should improve visitor satisfaction, enable better management and control of damaging activities and have some potential to protect the remainder of the area from indiscriminate use.

5. Problems Arising from Recreation Activity

The single most frequently voiced problem, on the part of those who live and work in the hills, concerns the activities of uncontrolled dogs, particularly at lambing. This problem arises from a very small percentage of users. Opportunities for the exercising of dogs were welcomed by 6% of visitors to the Kirk Road, 4% at Flotterstone and Harlaw and 2% at Threipmuir, but not all of these allowed dogs off the leash. The highest number of dogs recorded in any area was 33 in the period 12.30 to 18.00 at Flotterstone on 18.9.77. Only five of these dogs were observed off the road between the Hotel and the Water Keeper's cottage.

A number of observations also were made of the distribution of visitors at regular times throughout the day. The heaviest period of use, as might be expected, is between 14.30 and 17.30. However, the heaviest use of the "ridge path" between the Kips and Turnhouse seems to be in the mornings and about equal on both days of the weekend. Most of these users are confined to the "accepted" tracks, apart from an apparently growing number who walk from the summit of Carnethy in a roughly easterly direction towards Fala Knowe and the A702 junction with the Kirk Road, and a relatively small, but consistent, access to Harbour Hill at Bonaly and to Black and Hare Hills in the vicinity of Threipmuir. Those who climb Black Hill frequently descend by the White Cleugh. The only other unrecognised line of access on which groups regularly were observed is from the Knolls at Glencorse Burn around the south side of Glencorse Reservoir to near Logan Cottage, but the number involved is very small.
Other problems, such as littering, do not seem to be significantly on the increase, and are best countered with effective information and Ranger services.

Little of the damage done to stone walls seems attributable to recreational use. Apart from isolated cases of deliberate vandalism, some damage is attributable to livestock, but the overwhelming majority appears to result from natural causes.
## Table 1 - Details of Group and Individual Numbers Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Day and Date</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>No. of Groups</th>
<th>Total in Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flotterstone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 12.6.77</td>
<td>1130 - 1730</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 18.6.77</td>
<td>1530 - 1630</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 19.6.77</td>
<td>1300 - 1500</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5.7.77</td>
<td>1330 - 1630</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6.7.77</td>
<td>1500 - 1615</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 10.7.77</td>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 24.7.77</td>
<td>1315 - 1745</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 18.9.77</td>
<td>1215 - 1745</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19.9.77</td>
<td>1145 - 1745</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirk Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 12.6.77</td>
<td>1315 - 1715</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 10.7.77</td>
<td>1415 - 1645</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 24.7.77</td>
<td>1130 - 1245</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 18.9.77</td>
<td>1215 - 1330</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19.9.77</td>
<td>1145 - 1330</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threipmuir</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 22.6.77</td>
<td>1300 - 1515</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 26.6.77</td>
<td>1230 - 1700</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 06.7.77</td>
<td>1500 - 1700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12.7.77</td>
<td>1430 - 1630</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 07.8.77</td>
<td>1345 - 1745</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 18.9.77</td>
<td>1215 - 1800</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19.9.77</td>
<td>1230 - 1745</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harlaw</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 26.6.77</td>
<td>1115 - 1715</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 06.7.77</td>
<td>1500 - 1600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 07.8.77</td>
<td>1315 - 1800</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 18.9.77</td>
<td>1600 - 1730</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>772 groups</td>
<td>2237 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Proportion of Visitors in Four Age Groups (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Size of Groups (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Group</th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Method of Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Travel</th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Car</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-in</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Length of Stay (percentage of groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table/
Table 6 - Frequency of Previous Visits (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 - Distance Walked (kilometres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 - Pattern of Walking Routes (percentage of groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kirk Road</th>
<th>Flotterstone</th>
<th>Threipmuir</th>
<th>Harlaw</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Way (Return)</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Route</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.1 REVIEW

At the beginning of this study it seemed to the author that many of those whose tasks include planning and management for outdoor recreation had seen the concept of carrying capacity as a panacea for the problems being encountered in the maintenance of parks and other recreation areas under heavy pressure from visitors. Most emphasis was, at first, on the 'wear-and-tear' of resources, and hence on the maintenance of sites, with visitors being regarded as a problem. Later, there was greater emphasis on the quality of recreation experience, with a number of studies paying particular attention to the values and satisfactions of the users of wilderness areas. This extended the emphasis on carrying capacity beyond the site to larger zones or the park as a whole. The next essential step seemed to be extension of the concept to consideration of the carrying capacity of the whole system of recreation places of a wider area.

The implications of such an extension appeared to be that carrying capacity would have to be regarded as the total sustained ability of a system of outdoor recreation places to provide opportunities for satisfaction of the widest possible range of recreational needs of society as a whole. It seemed, however, that although much was said about providing opportunities along these lines, most
attention was in fact given to particular types of activities in particular physical environments; that the overall emphasis of studies of "ecological" carrying capacity was on the individual site; and that the overall emphasis of studies of "aesthetic" carrying capacity was on the individual person. It appeared to the author that these concerns were too narrowly defined and that the maintenance of the quality of individual sites and experiences must depend upon whether the available opportunities were being used in the most appropriate fashion.

As mentioned above, a focus on the individual site seemed to lead to visitors being regarded as a problem and three particular aspects of this "problem" can be emphasised:
(1) there often are too many visitors, with the result that either sites deteriorate because of erosion, or the sense of crowding causes dissatisfaction with the quality of experience, or both;
(2) many visitors seem to wish to undertake recreational pursuits that are either inappropriate to the site or more appropriate to other sites; and
(3) many visitors seem not to understand the value of the site and thoughtlessly or deliberately cause damage, leave litter and behave in a manner which offends other visitors.

Reflection on these aspects of the problem suggested
that no satisfactory solution was likely to come from attempts to limit the number of visitors, to ban certain activities, or to police behaviour by visitors unless some concerted attempt was made to provide, within a system of recreational places, a range of opportunities relevant to the needs of all visitors. It was assumed that, since recreational behaviour is generally accepted as being the discretionary use of free time, every visitor to a park or site had some motive for his visit and that, while for some the site itself was the reason, for others it was what could be done (or was assumed to be possible) at the site.

This reasoning led to a consideration of why different motives for recreation behaviour seemed to be associated with different perceptions of the importance of Nature and why there are large differences in tolerance for the simultaneous presence of other visitors. Some of the relevant points were discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively.

Because it became clear that the most likely solution to the problem of a poor relationship between the supply of recreation opportunities and the needs and demand for them lay in an application of systems planning, some consideration was given both to the concept of park systems and to existing systems. It had also become clear, however, that the achievement of comprehensive systems of
parks which would provide a suitable environment for a full range of recreational needs depended very heavily upon how a balance between individually-oriented and socially-oriented interests could be achieved through the planning system. This led to consideration of three subjects relevant to park system planning, the first two preceding the discussion of systems in Chapter 4 and the third immediately following it. These subjects were:

(1) the philosophical underpinnings of the demands for control measures to ensure conservation of parks;
(2) the principles on which judgments were made about what recreation activities should be given priority; and
(3) the constraints imposed on planning and development of recreation systems by the unequal power of the supporters of different priorities.

The first subject arose when it became apparent that the balance between interests depended on their relative influence on the planning system and that this in itself was related to the ability of those interests to put their case. One particular case which is very strongly made in park-related issues is that of the interests in conservation of "natural beauty". In Chapter 2, therefore, the narrower perspective of conservation groups concerned with "saving" Nature from the drastic consequences of Man's power as an agent of ecological change was contrasted with the wider perspective of the "environmentalist" concern with "redeeming" the earth by promoting a more sympathetic
relationship between man and his surroundings which would result in a higher quality of environment for all men in all places and make much conservationist concern unnecessary. It was suggested that a wider adoption of the environmentalist perspective is necessary in order to reduce the amount of issue-oriented conflict, and to increase the weight given to the interests of those who do not have such a readily-identifiable "cause" to give cohesion to a group.

The second subject arose when consideration of the concept of prepotency of needs, a discussion of which was included in Chapter 3, suggested that the weight of cohesive interest groups was heavily in support of individual or "autonomous" needs and that their influence could be seen in a growing tendency to reject attention to social needs particularly in national parks. This led to further consideration of privately-oriented and publicly-oriented wants and of planning according to "want-regarding" and "ideal-regarding" principles. Here the author suggests that the last is more appropriate to the strategic issues of planning such as were the subject of the case studies reported in Chapters 8 and 9.

The consideration of the principles on which systems planning might operate if attention were to be given to a full range of recreational needs led to study of systems concepts, particularly as they relate to park system
planning. A very limited discussion of some aspects of this subject was included in Chapter 4. The main emphasis was on the way in which attempts are made to control the structure of park systems through classification and zoning policies which are designed to permit the separation of conflicting activities and control of the intensity of use.

The third subject - the constraints imposed on planning and development of recreation systems by the unequal power of different interests - was illustrated through an account of the attempts to secure area wide access to the countryside and to establish national parks in Great Britain. These attempts had some success in England and Wales but very little in Scotland where national parks, in particular, were firmly rejected. The major difference was that in England the attempt to secure access had strong support from groups such as the Ramblers Association and its affiliated bodies, but in Scotland this association was weak and disinclined to support the movement. Because amenity and nature conservation could be supported without any legislation for access and national parks, there was no other force to balance the opposition from other powerful vested interests in Scotland, particularly the opposition from landowners, farmers and participants in field sports.

Because the author's interest lay in the regional,
even national, applicability of the concept of carrying capacity rather than in its application at the level of sites or, instantaneously, to the psychological or aesthetic carrying capacity relevant to individuals, it began to appear that the most important determinant of carrying capacity was the spatial pattern and structure of the system of opportunities that developed through the resolution of conflicting demands. That is to say, the system is a product of its conflicts, and it was apparent that some aspects of park system planning were more prone to conflict than others. Two particular lines of inquiry were followed in the investigation of this subject, and some of the points which arose are included in the discussion in Chapters 3 to 5. The first consideration was of the values of the participants in a conflict and their goals based on those values. It was noted that some of the most highly-polarised opinions occurred over conservation issues and that there is a particularly high propensity for conflict to occur over two parallel issues; namely, crowding and the right to do as one pleases with one's own land. It seemed to be very significant that the conflict on these issues, particularly the first, was often carried over from particular locations even when the participants were not present and, moreover, that these issues could be a source of conflict even though a participant had no personal knowledge of the area of concern. This led directly to the second consideration which was the parallel between some ecological
concepts and some aspects of recreational carrying capacity.

The most important ecological parallels were seen to do with concepts related to competition, particularly the competition between species for the occupancy of a niche and the mechanisms of niche maintenance, of which the two most obvious are suppression and exclusion. It was concluded that, in many respects, recreation has a territorial basis and that many of the most direct conflicts stem from the different territorial demands or interests of different individuals. Some of the current literature suggests that these differences have many points of origin in the social and cultural background of the individual, and reference was made in Chapter 3 to some of these studies. The opposition to proposals for parks from landowners and related interests also seems to be an example of attempts to defend territory and it is noted that the conservationist, farming and sporting interests were all reacting to a threat to their value and/or use of land, i.e., they were reacting to stress.

It seemed, therefore, that if a system was conceived to be a product of its conflicts, the important thing to know would be what situations caused stress sufficient to result in conflict, and what mechanisms operated in these situations. Here another ecological concept, adaptability, proved useful and some discussion of it was
included in order to support the suggestion that a distinction can be drawn between reaction and response to a stress. It is now suggested that, where the stress takes the form of a threat, response is more effective than reaction, and that the most powerful relevant threat is the threat of some change in the planning system for recreation because, as a rule, it is through the planning system that changes in the distribution and purpose of parks and other recreational opportunities are made. If such changes are seen as threatening then, obviously, the most satisfactory response to the threat is to attempt either to prevent the change in the planning system which would enable the changes in the pattern of land use to be undertaken or, if such changes are inevitable, to modify the planning system so as to have some ability to control the measures introduced by it to achieve its goals for change in the recreational system. Both these responses can be seen in the case studies.

Before turning to the conclusions to be drawn from these studies, however, it is suggested that the considerations outlined above and the aspects of them that it was possible to develop in the text of this thesis led to the conclusion that, because the limits to the capacity of a park and recreation system will be set by the position and nature of its components, the single most important factor (when attention is directed beyond the level of the individual site or visitor) is the control of the development of the pattern (position) and structure (nature) of
the system. For this reason, an understanding of the power of interest groups to influence or control the planning system appears to be fundamental to an understanding of the resolution of conflict. In the author's view the value of this thesis would have been greater had it been possible to include an evaluation of the power of the different groups concerned in the case studies, and to give more attention to the alliances they formed. One important reason for this inability is that neither the Park System for Scotland nor the Pentland Hills Regional Park have yet been established, despite the reasonable assumption at the beginning of the study that both proposals - certainly the latter - would reach completion. This delay in itself is a measure of the power of the opposition to the proposals and the ability of the opponents to force adjustments of the proposals by engaging in conflict over the issues that they raised. The battle over the proposed park system is still being fought and the original concept appears to have been weakened as a result. The battle over the parts of the system has yet to be fought on a wide front, but the proposal for a regional park in the Pentland Hills provides an indication of the issues that will be raised and the strength of the likely conflict over them.

While many of these issues, as they arose in the Pentland Hills, were studied, not all could be discussed within the confines of this thesis. The major conflicts that arose there and which seem likely to occur in other
Specific proposals were:

(1) the implications of designation, especially use of the word "park";

(2) the rights of owners and occupiers and the supremacy of individual over public interest;

(3) the impact of recreational activities on other forms of land use;

(4) the relative priority to be attached to different types of recreational need;

(5) the role of public participation in the park planning process; and

(6) the composition of advisory and management committees.

Particular subjects likely to be of more general concern included:

(1) the boundaries of the park;

(2) the location of main nodes of development;

(3) the propriety of planning control over agricultural land use changes;

(4) visitor behaviour and the "interpretation" of the park;

(5) the content and operation of management agreements.

10.2 DISCUSSION

Allison has suggested that most people put their faith in the preservation aspects of the planning system rather than in progressive and creative forward planning. This seems to be the core of the problem with the proposals for park development in Scotland. The overriding
issue for most of the interest groups consulted was that recreation was a use of the land that needed to be controlled, and there was a fundamental opposition to attempts to establish a new pattern of provision and distribution of use. In the Pentland Hills every projected or suspected change to the existing pattern was fought as an independent issue regardless of its significance to the proposals as a whole. Despite the stated desire of the planning authority for the conclusion of management agreements and the acceptance by the land interests that these were essential and desirable, the complications of tenure and the fundamental objection to the park concept frustrated attempts to reach agreement. Experience in the English national parks has shown the difficulty in reaching agreements where the conflict is between agricultural change and the conservation of amenity, yet farmers are on the whole, basically sympathetic to conservation. There is not the same sympathy for recreation and it is difficult to imagine that management agreements will be seen by farmers and landowners as anything other than a method of control of recreation, i.e., it is unlikely that they will be widely accepted as integral parts of policies for the redevelopment of patterns of recreational use. The Upland Management Experiment (UMEX) \(^2\) in the Lake District National Park and its successors have provided a start to the use of management agreements, but much more extensive development of the legislative and financial support for agreements will be necessary if they are to provide the desired basis
for integrated management in a Scottish Park System. The importance of this cannot be overemphasised, but the difficulty can clearly be seen from the case of the Pentland Hills where the Advisory Committee demanded that no design or development work be undertaken until a full management plan had been drawn up and approved, yet the responsible Department, having no management control over most of the area, was unable to reach agreements with the majority of landowners and farmers because of the unwillingness of some to negotiate and the insistence of others on the impossible condition that agreements should not be negotiated individually. In this situation, the need for the Department to assuage such interests and the lack of any group capable of forcefully putting the case for recreation, meant that the debate did not turn to the question of whether, given the position of the Pentland Hills in relation to Edinburgh and their obvious importance as a recreation resource, the extraordinarily complex landownership system required some reallocation, including an increase in the amount of land in public ownership.

Similarly, it is clear that the debate on the proposal for the Pentland Hills is unlikely to include consideration of the possibility of a reduction in the potential for conflict and an increase in the overall satisfaction of all land users in the hills, farmers included, through a reallocation of priorities which would give public recreation supremacy over other considerations in certain areas. There also is little likelihood that the Pentland Hills Advisory Committee will take any more tolerant view of less individualistic
needs for recreation, and it can be expected that pressure will be maintained for the confinement of all new developments to the proposed Northern Slopes Country Park.

The author suggests that this type of desire (and the general tendency to see a very limited range of activities, scarcely if at all overlapping, as relevant to each category of park in an ascending order of importance), is inappropriate on two counts, firstly, that it leads to the rejection of some genuine recreational needs and, secondly, that it ignores the concept of diversity and its related hypothesis that a highly diverse habitat, community or environment is more intrinsically stable than one with low diversity.

A reasonable illustration of the first count seems to be possible by analogy with the framing of an education system, while the illustration of speech in Chapter 1 bears upon the second. In regard to the first it is suggested that the person responsible for a system of education would acknowledge the various levels in it, from pre-school up to university, with two particular considerations. Firstly, that within any broad division, such as primary-secondary-tertiary, he would acknowledge the need for different grades and that there would be individual differences within those grades; no education planner would expect the child entering high school to begin at sixth form, and by analogy, no recreation planner should expect the casual visitor to a national park to have a high level of under-
standing of its national biological importance. Secondly, at any level the planner would plan separately for all subjects of the curriculum, i.e., because a student entered high school it would not be assumed that he now should study only mathematics. The planner would plan separately at each level, for mathematics, history, English and other subjects to devise a curriculum that would be matched to classrooms, teachers, and students.

By analogy the recreation planner should plan a pattern of opportunities related to the available resources, the interests and abilities of park staff, and the needs and prior experience of the visitors. The second analogy, discussed in Chapter 1, was that many parts of the human body (such as the mouth) have several functions, but depend on other parts (such as the teeth and tongue) for the best performance of those functions (such as eating and speaking). This led to the related conclusion that, just as in human communication the message is intrinsically inferior in the absence of all the parts of the communication "system", and understood by fewer people, so parks will be inferior, and less well understood if they provide only a limited range of experiences. The incompatibility between recreation and conservation is accentuated by failure to achieve reservation of adequate diversity through the planning system. It has been part of the purpose of this thesis to emphasise that this failure to reserve - or create - adequate diversity is due to the ability of interest groups to determine either the existence of parks, or their content, or both.
In both the proposals analysed, and in the developments discussed in Chapter 5, the early stages of formulation of ideas were shrouded in varying degrees of secrecy. In respect to the Scottish proposal, the public at large has had almost no say in a very long debate about a provision of critical interest to the whole population of Scotland, mainly because of the consideration that had to be given to the conditions which must be met in order to gain acceptance of the proposal by pressure groups. Thus, it is seen that most open public participation about a matter of national importance has been delayed until sectional or vested interests have submitted comments leading to modification of the proposals. The consideration of alternatives is not a free matter; when the proposal becomes a real public issue most alternatives and the basis for the proposal will already have been decided. There is the very real possibility that, as far as the general public is concerned, the proposal for a Park System for Scotland will never become an issue because objections to it could still lead, as they have done with other proposals for national parks in Scotland, to its abandonment. Similarly, in the Pentland Hills issue the objectors repeatedly and forcefully opposed any publicity which referred to the area as a "park" until their own conditions about its content and development had been incorporated in a "management plan" for the whole area.

It appears that one of the underlying judgments on which the opposition to use of the word 'park' and
development according to a park concept were based, was an attitude that other people did not, indeed could not, understand the importance of the areas they were determined to preserve. This was a common judgment among amenity interests in the Pentland Hills case, but one of the best examples can be seen in the Dartmoor Preservation Association (DPA). For example, in addressing the non-statutory inquiry into military use of Dartmoor National Park

"Dr. Beech (Chief Executive Officer of the DPA) referred scathingly to the evidence of Plymouth City Council who said that most users of the national park come from Plymouth, except in the height of summer, and do not find the military presence unacceptable. This, he thought, implied that the park exists mainly for motorists. 'Proper appreciation of Dartmoor', he said, 'is impossible unless one walks or rides on horse or pony ...'" (emphasis added).

The Secretary of the Association subsequently acknowledged that their view was a minority one, and asserted that minority views must be regarded, but it is clear that members of this Association have little respect for the views of the majority of visitors, and none at all for their opponents, going so far as to attribute to them "totally barren minds". In contrast "there are others, many others, who experience a sense of liberation and renewal whenever they set foot on wild land. ... They are intelligent and perceptive people of every class and age group ...".

The common outcome of attitudes such as this is
preoccupation with the education of visitors and with
countryside interpretation. This has its most notice-
able outcomes in a plethora of "visitor centres" at parks
and reserves, and the constant promotion of the "Country
Code" of behaviour. The principle seems to be that the
visitor with little or no rural background, who comes
from a city where littering is rife, where dogs are given
relatively free run of parks, and who must return to the
same conditions, will have an entirely different set of
standards simply because he is in the "better" environ-
ment of open countryside. There appears to be no real
justification for this view. The fact that superb
national parks are plagued by littering and vandalism,
that carefully planned cities are bedevilled with alcoholism
and other drug addictions, and that suicides, divorce and
psycho-somatic diseases cause equal alarm in both village
and city, casts the gravest doubt on such a proposition.
Nevertheless, the ideas that quality of life is bound up
with certain standards of physical environment and that
behaviour appropriate to "good" environment can be absorbed
from a list of commandments, persist. The conclusions
in this study about the necessity for provision of re-
creational opportunities to be made relevant to needs
suggest to the author that a far more effective course
would be to attempt to reduce the distinction between (a)
national parks and (b) local opportunities; and that the
most urgent step is to improve the opportunities for
socially oriented recreation in the open air. It is clear,
however, that wherever such attempts are made in an area
with sufficient natural attraction to provide a focus, opposition from conservation and amenity movements is almost inevitable.

Anyone who has studied conservation movements cannot fail to be aware of the high degree of emotionalism with which some members approach issues. The Pentland Hills area has not been free of this and it is notable that even though the Countryside Division is almost entirely in sympathy with most of the objectives of the conservation groups, the methods of reaction of some have reached such a high level of conflict that in self-defence the Division has made adjustments which reduce the ability of these groups to mount an attack. The reaction of some conservation groups has shown a single-minded preoccupation with short-term objectives and a failure to recognise that these objectives may not be consistent with their long-term goals. Informal interviews and discussion with group members indicated that little if any difference was seen between short-term and long-term objectives. There are many powerful forces in the socio-cultural environment which exert pressure through the planning system for the modification of land-use patterns. If all such modifications are seen as defeats by the conservation groups it is likely that their opposition will become increasingly intransigent.

Like the landowners and farmers, the amenity and
conservation groups' opposition appeared to be allied to a sense of proprietary right; all were reacting on the basis of what seemed to be a territorial imperative by which the planners, and the hordes of visitors they believed to be in their train, were seen as aggressors.

The arguments raised here and in earlier chapters are, therefore, believed to support the view that much conflict over recreational development can be compared with the ecological concept of territoriality. Soja defines territoriality as

"a behavioural phenomenon associated with the organisation of space into spheres of influence or clearly demarcated territories which are made distinctive and considered at least partially exclusive by their occupants or definers". He notes that its "most obvious geographical manifestation is an identifiable patterning of spatial relationships resulting in the confinement of certain activities in particular areas and the exclusion of certain categories of individuals from the space of the territorial individual or group". 5 (emphasis added)

A further dimension of exclusion is relevant to this study, namely the exclusion of certain activities from a territory not only because it is the space of a particular individual or group but because of their impact on the territory itself. This is in fact a more important characteristic of park territories than is confinement because there are more activities which are considered inappropriate to parks than there are activities considered to be appropriate only to parks. Nevertheless, parks are very definitely territories in concept and, in Great Britain, this territoriality is complicated by the fact that a far greater
range of activities, particularly commercial activities, are permitted than in parks in other countries. That means a far greater range of issues that can generate conflict and require an adjustment from the planning system which has ramifications in the structure of the park or park system, and therefore determines carrying capacity.

10.3 CONCLUSION

This study would have been more conclusive if one or both of the case studies had reached some point of decision, i.e., if one could identify dividing lines between the development of either proposal and the results that issued from it. In their absence it is not possible to state with any certainty the final effect of the conflict over the proposals on the structure of the park or park system. To a large degree the real problem lay with the delay in the Countryside Commission's proposal because legal status for regional parks depends on new legislative support for the park system. The absence of such legal status was a telling argument in the attempts by opponents to delay the supplementation of the proposal for a regional park and, indeed, in support of their determination that the area should not be called a park.

Much of this uncertainty may have been resolved if more information had been available from the Countryside Commission for Scotland or the Scottish Development
Department. However, because the accepted policy is to reach agreement before making a proposal public, it is unlikely that there would be any opportunity in the near future, if at all, to gain access to confidential records of negotiations.

The length of this account has been of great concern to the author but as no other source could be found in which the themes of environmentalism, recreational need, systems planning and carrying capacity had been brought together in such a way as to highlight the importance of conflict in determining patterns of activity on the ground and the location of structural forms related to those activities, the attempt to draw out important issues was considered worthwhile. The information on park systems in Canada, and their associated zoning policies was collected at a time when it seemed possible that decisive steps would be taken, at least in the Pentland Hills. As it became obvious that no such event would occur the author undertook a study of all the recently published National Park Plans for England and Wales. However, as the content and quality of these plans is so highly varied, it was not possible to draw an adequate comparison between Canadian and British plans and procedures.

One other matter was given considerable thought, namely, the possibility of undertaking a detailed study of the impact of recreation on a limited number of properties in the Pentland Hills area. However, the
fundamental opposition of owners and farmers and the extraordinarily complicated land tenure pattern ruled out such a study, as did the author's lack of knowledge of British farming practice and farm economy.

Two other possible lines of research are suggested. Firstly, an attempt could be made to test the application of the model of competition introduced in Chapter 1 and developed in Chapter 6 with some empirical data from an actual new development. Unfortunately, in this inquiry, there was no time for such an exercise once the concept of carrying capacity had been sufficiently clarified in the author's mind. A newly-developed urban or urban-fringe facility would probably be more appropriate for developing some procedure for testing this model because of the greater ease in setting the boundaries of the area to be studied.

The second possible line of research arises from past experience in attempting to classify recreational resources. Considerable dissatisfaction has developed with classifications based entirely on biophysical attributes and landscape classification seemed to be even less useful for that particular task. It seems that what is necessary is some identification of typical recreation "packages" for which some idealised set of resource requirements could be derived for comparison with the real resources of an area. The author chose to call the individuals related to these packages recreation "archetypes".
It is suggested that "archetypes" would have more relevance to a study such as this than would the activity clusters identified in recreation substitutability studies because the consideration of the competition model suggested that if recreation archetypes could be identified, together with recreation niches, then from this one could go on to estimate recreation potential and the potential for conflict for the use of the resources of a 'niche'.

To be useful in attempts at conflict resolution it would be necessary to identify the attributes of two critical indicators in relation to archetypes. There were, firstly, 'definition', or the degree to which it would be possible to focus on a particular archetype (independently of other types); and, secondly, 'sufficiency', or whether the number of individuals of one archetype would be large enough (at a particular time) to justify provision to meet the special needs of the archetype. These points could be rephrased as:

(1) Is there enough information to identify archetypes?

(2) Could one expect to succeed in management programmes (and in planning) directed towards archetypes?

(3) Which archetypes are of sufficient size or importance to justify provision directed specifically towards them?

(4) Do the requirements of those archetypes identified match the objectives of the
management system, i.e., does meeting their needs support both social goals and park "values"?

Factors which affect the identification and behaviour of archetypes could be grouped into four classes of what might be (and are in retail marketing) called 'segmentation variables' because they have proved to be good predictors of different attitudes, i.e., they correlate with behaviour or propensity to behave. These are:

1. geographic variables, such as climate, infrastructure, population density and distribution;
2. demographic variables, such as age, sex, income, occupation, education and stage of family life cycle;
3. personality variables, such as gregariousness, conservatism, leadership and domesticity; and
4. behaviour variables, such as usage rate, motivation, visitor loyalty, and aesthetic sensitivity.

The last are relationships between the user and the resource. Cheek et al (see Chapter 3) would undoubtedly add some factor related to family background to include such things as where one lived in his childhood and what recreation experiences were enjoyed within the family and peer group relationships. This probably could go into class 3 – "personality variables" but may be better distinguished as:

5. cultural variables, such as social milieu of destination, residential origin, image of place, leisure life style and social order.
The idea is that these variables should provide a guide for the promotion of a recreational resource, and the success of an interpretation strategy. It is suggested that the use of archetypes could indicate levels of use at which conflict is likely, i.e., they could assist in the identification of thresholds of carrying capacity. This is, however, speculation and the author has doubts about whether archetypes would make a significant contribution to understanding of conflicts over goals as opposed to conflicts over problems such as crowding.

In conclusion, it is noted that, despite the considerable progress made in developing a planning system in Great Britain which has substantial control of the spread of urbanisation, this system is less able to control other uses of the countryside because it has not yet found an adequate methodology for identifying and balancing the needs and priorities of the whole population. Containment of the sprawl of buildings is one thing, but containment of the sprawl of people is another. Since that sprawl is recreation-oriented, and because there is as yet no alternative to parks, it is clear that systematic planning for park provision must be directed towards using parks to contain demand of the type that now is using nationally significant countryside resources for experiences which could be provided in the other areas, including urban areas, if the legal structure were to establish workable patterns for the solution of conflicts within
which the administrative structure would be able to
direct the integration of recreation with other land
uses.
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