

Visitor Experience Guidance

Summary of comments

01 Gartmore CC/Gartmore Community Trust – Agree with the changes.

02 Private Individual – Agree with changes as there has been an incredible amount of applications for visitor infrastructure. Further protection is needed to prevent expansion of existing car parks. There would be clearer reference to the applicant making justification from a business and local economy perspective, particularly if car park is near to a village or town car park. Any new car park/visitor facilities must prove it is beneficial to the immediate local economy and cannot be met within 1.5mile radius of the proposed site. There is concern over car parks and visitor centres outwith towns and villages that would damage fragile rural economy.

Every new road/path/car park will result in habitat loss and there is still encourage of developments in protected sites. Applicant should prove that their development cannot happen elsewhere.

Comments regarding demand not being currently met in relation to path is constructed and 2 years later the applicant uses to justify a visitor centre/café.

03 Kilmaronock Community Council – The increase in demand for infrastructure was in response to covid and is time limited. It should not set the benchmark for demand.

Do not agree with definition of small-scale – small scale should be 10-20 spaces, medium 20-30 spaces and large is over 30 spaces. All small-scale or larger greenfield parking developments should be submit to Travel Plan assessments and EIA. Car Parks should not be at the expense of greenfield. Visitor management can enable visitor control and expansion is not mandatory. A new or larger car park should not be created to attract more visitors but only accommodate existing demand. All greenfield sites or within/close to protected sites should be subject to environmental scrutiny.

Other comments made in relation to impact of excess people, vehicles during covid and the need for solutions that are economically viable, not be over ambitious and deliver on the primary aim of the National Park.

04 Private Individual – Agree that the guidance should be revised as numbers of visitors have been detrimental to our environment and annoyance to residents. More facilities need to be place for campervans/mobile homes and more policing of illegal camping and anti-social behaviour. Agree with definition of small-scale. Other comments – provision of park and ride or walk hubs and honey pots will reduce the need for more parking in rural areas. The last 2 summers have seen visitor ignoring that car parks are full and leaving cars on verges/roadsides. It is not just planning that can resolve, policing is needed. Callander is referred to as a visitor hub but the visitor centre was closed and is now only functioning with volunteers. There is over reliance on volunteers to provide services. Planning for tourism developments should put more emphasis on protecting the rights of residents.

05 Loch Lomond and the Trossachs Countryside Trust – Yes agree the guidance needs revised. A number of suggestions are made in relation to the car park guidance in relation to connectivity into other mobility networks such as paths and sustainable transport. Supporting statement should focus on providing mobility hubs as this can incorporate parking for cars but with more integrated transport solutions. The guidance should make it clear that sustainable transport should be prioritised over additional car parks. New car parks should be resisted.

06 British Horse Society – No comments

07 Stirling Council, Transport Development Team – No comments

08 Scottish Government Development Plans Team – Comments relating to Vacant and Derelict Land and how these sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites.

09 Sportscotland – No comments

10 Private Individual – Do not agree with definition of small-scale – small scale should be 1 to 10 spaces. Some further comments in relation to the importance of the landscape quality and biodiversity of the National Park and the need to take account of cumulative impacts and development creep. Facilities in countryside locations should not be installed or developed as new is an existing car park can be expanded. Water quality is an important issue that should be mentioned. Concern also raised over campervans.

11 Luss and Arden Community Council – Yes agree with the revisions.

12 Sustrans – No comments

13 Strathclyde Passenger Transport (SPT) – No comments

14 Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) – No comments

15 Historic Environment Scotland (HES) – No comments

16 Transport Scotland – No comments