How should land be managed within the National Park to benefit both people and nature?

The key changes that are needed to address the climate and environment crises are to reduce deer numbers - current targets of c10 per square kilometre are far to high - and to end intensive grouse moor management. This cannot happen under the current system of private landownership for sporting purposes. Along with tackling these two key issues, the CNPA should zone how land is managed: some areas - the Wild Land areas would be a good place to start - should have as their primary purpose the restoration of natural processes and in these nature should be left to recover itself (apart from management of deer numbers which is necessary in the absence of top predators); other areas should be zoned to allow for sustainable farming and forestry. Sporting estates employ very few people and have resulted in the depopulation of rural areas and putting nature first in large areas of the National Park is quite compatible with creating more rural jobs and more housing in remoter locations.

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: 'There is a good balance between people and nature within the National Park'?

Neither agree nor disagree

Why do you say that?

This and the three other questions asking people the extent to which they agree with statements are not fit for purpose, covering a multitude of different topics, each of which could have a different answer. The CNPA should have been askng open questions

What should be our priorities to help businesses and communities recover in the wake of Covid-19?

While how to get over Covid is an important issue, should it really be one of the themes for a plan that is supposed to cover the next five years? Is recovery what we want? The previous economic system has failed the people in the National Park creating low paid jobs and resulting in those working in the National Park having nowhere to live.

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: 'I am confident that the economy in the Cairngorms National Park will recover quickly after Covid-19'?

Neither agree and disagree

Why do you say that?

Another terrible question but all the signs are that the world economy continues to be in crisis and that crisis will affect the National Park

What steps do individuals, communities, businesses and organisations need to take for the National Park to reach net zero emissions?

Unlike other questions this one a) assumes an outcome (rather than asking how we tackle climate change) and b) considers this in isolation. With so much wild land available the issue should not be how the National Park achieves net zero but what its contribution should be to Scotland and the world more generally. The CNPA should be aiming for the National Park to be a net absorber of carbon. That means tackling certain issues as a matter of urgency: a ban on all muirburn, ending use of plastic tree tubes, requiring all housing to meet passivhaus standards etc

How important is it that individuals, communities, businesses and organisations take action to tackle climate change in the Cairngorms National Park?

Very important

Why do you say that?

The future of the world depends on it

What support do people need to have a greater say in the way their local community or area is run?

While there is a place for support, what is more important is that the barriers to participation are removed eg the CNPA needs to start acting more transparently and not do things like agree the draft NPPP in secret

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: 'local communities have an important part to play in shaping the future of the Cairngorms National Park'?

Strongly agree

Why do you say that?

It should be obvious that local communities have an important role but this does not mean that they are the only people who should have a role. Its a National Park and national interests also need to be considered

How can we welcome visitors to the National Park while protecting local communities, landscapes and wildlife?

The implication of this question is that visitors somehow harms local communities - they shouldn't, tourism is key for job - landscapes and wildlife. Nothing is asked about the destructive impact of sporting estates on landscape and wildlife, a far more serious issues

What is your view about the number of visitors coming to the National Park at present (c. two million per year)?

Other

Why do you say that?

I fail to understand the relevance of this question and taking numbers of tourists out of context. What is important is whether the infrastructure to support tourists in adequate. Its not.

What practical measures would help you and other people explore and enjoy the Park more easily?

Radically improved public transport and better infrastructure for camping and campervans

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: 'The Cairngorms National Park is accessible to people like me'?

Neither agree nor disagree

What makes you say that?

Which of the six key themes we've been discussing is most important to you?

Don't know / can't decide

Why do you say that?

This is another terrible question and one I refuse to answer

Are there any other key priorities for the Cairngorms National Park we've not covered so far?

The themes, as phrased, don't seem to me to cover any of the key priorities apart possibly from climate change. The great unsaid is land ownership and land reform. But its seems to me the National Park needs to be phrased in ways that clearly address the key issues: tackling low pay and lack of housing for people who work in the National Park; tackling the environmental crisis - which means ending the traditional sporting estate; provision of suitable infrastructure to support tourism and outdoor recreation; using the planning system to ensure ALL future built development in the National Park is carbon neutral etc