Callander Landscape Partnership: Path Audit
Stage 2: Path Projects

Summary
Stage 1 of the Callander Path Audit covered a review of an extensive network of existing and aspirational footpaths around Callander, identified by the Callander Countryside Group (CCG). From this review six potential projects were identified by the CCG as priority projects.

Stage 2 of the audit, this document, describes in more detail the six potential projects. This is intended to assist the Callander Landscape Partnership (CLP) in determining projects to take forward to the Stage 2 Implementation Stage of the Callander Landscape Partnership Scheme (CLP).
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Introduction

Context

1. Following the Stage 1 Audit of the wider path network, 6-path projects have been identified by the Callander Countryside Group (CCG) to be developed to greater detail. This is to allow a better assessment of feasibility in respect to the Callander Landscape Partnership (CLP) Stage 2 submission to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). A further path from the town centre to Callander Crags was added in May 2017.

2. This document describes the projects as progressed to date and is presented for consultation and comment and to assist in preparation of the draft Project Plans for the Stage 2 HLF submission currently being prepared by the CLP.

3. These proposals are based on one site visit and would benefit from additional visits to verify details and take on-board various details that came out if a progress meeting in December and at a Workshop in January 2017. The proposals are indicative, but are considered sufficient for Pre-Application Planning Consultation with LLTNPA and consultation with landowners. It is intended also that there is sufficient information for development of the Stage 2 Project Plans for the HLF submission.

4. An outline proposal was prepared for a further path link at Kilmahog. This is not included here since the path is being developed by the CLP in conjunction with Transport Scotland and LLTNPA.

Method

5. The network has been walked for the Stage 1 Overview. Priority paths were agreed with CCG /CLP at a meeting in December 2016. A draft of this report was submitted to the CLP in January 2017 for comment, now finalised in this draft. Subsequently, a number of iterations of this report have taken account of further comments from CLP and the evolving Stage 2 submission to HLF.

Costs

6. Cost estimates are ‘ball-park’ and subject to detailed survey and design. Rates used are based on: a) “Paths for All” guidance; b) similar tendered path work at Loch Lomond (2016); and c) similar tendered access work in Argyll (2014). Costs have been calculated by take-off of path lengths and schedule of rates applied. This breakdown can be made available if required. At this stage there is no detailed design available and professional judgement has been used to develop the cost estimate. 10% has been included for contractor’s preliminaries and 10% for contingency. No allowance has been made for legal costs, land acquisition, maintenance and inflation.

7. An estimate of fees and consents has been added to project costs. This includes:
   - Planning fees, plus fee for advertising the applications;
   - Allowance for design and survey fees, including, where relevant:
     o Project management, including design, QS fees, CDM etc;
     o Specialist surveys, including, where relevant:
       - Engineer (bridge work);
       - Habitat, archaeological and tree surveys;
       - Topographic surveys.

8. There could be economies of scale by combining schemes.

9. Planning fees for an individual application max at £2020. There would be cost savings for combining planning applications. If the Community Council act as applicant Planning Consent fees would be halved.

10. As with all construction cost estimates, actual costs can only be determined through tendering.

---

1 ‘Estimating price guide for path projects’ PfA 2014 with a 20% up-lift
2 ‘Preliminaries’ include typical over-head costs for a commercial contract.
Project 1: Callander Crags-Bracklinn Link

**Project Objective**

11. Provide a missing link in an ‘off-road’ walking route between Callander Crags main car park and the existing path network leading to the Bracklinn Falls.

12. The lower woodland at Callander Crags is subject to an on-going Community Land Purchase, through which existing paths will be upgraded. The proposed path link will join into these paths and provide a walking route from the town to the Bracklinn Glen and Bracklinn Falls with options to tie into a range of other rural paths. As such the project fulfils an important local objective, improving linkages to viewpoints, natural heritage interest and historic sites.

13. Note the site has been walked but was not looked at in detail as was not a Project at that time.

**Additional benefits**

14. The path will provide: a) Excellent views over Callander; b) Additional path linkages within the Crags and wider area; and c) Opportunities for landscape and nature interpretation.

**Existing situation**

15. At present, walkers wanting to get to the Bracklinn Falls must walk up the public road from the Callander Crags car park, which is here steep and has blind corners. The proposed path route part up-grades existing paths and part follows a feint desire line. The desire line path is rough and wet and blocked by fallen timber. The setting is part commercial conifer forest and part broadleaf. Existing paths are good, but steep and rough.

**Constraints**

16. The existing forest track (A-B) is a 3m wide aggregate track in good condition, requiring no work. It is in use for timber haulage periodically.

17. The existing Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) waymarked path B-C is, of its type, a well-constructed soil reversal path. However, the path is steep and surface rough.

18. The line of proposed new path C-D-E crosses steeply sloping, rough hillside, passing through clear fell and wind throw. There are areas of poor drainage and bog and a number of small ditches to cross. FCS is undertaking forestry management and re-stocking in the area. A deer fence above the path is proposed by FCS to provide deer exclusion. There is wind-throw to conifer edges which will require making safe.

19. Surveys to check for Red-Squirrel dreys, bat roosts, otters, badgers, rare plants and tree hazard would probably be required. There will be constraints on working within the bird nesting season that may affect tree clearance work. There may be a requirement for licensing specific activities (such as in connection with Red Squirrel) requiring consultation with SNH.

**Proposals**

20. **Map 1** shows proposals and options.

- A-B is forest track with no work other than directional signage.
- Path B-C is an existing moderate difficulty path with gradients >8%. Options are: a) use existing path; b) up-grade by re-surfacing; or c) provide a new of-line path of reduced gradients (subject to survey);
- Path C-D-E is a new path, traversing hillside. Proposal is a soil-reversal path with imported aggregate surface, whindust sealed. The path follows a desire line;
- Path D-F is an option that runs direct to the Bracklinn Glen car park. This is an aspiration that will require survey and tree management;
- Path C-G is an optional new path that avoids steep slope on B-C and is a new soil reversal path as C-D-E above.
**Signage**

21. Directional signage is required at each end of the paths, with waymarks at junctions.

**Accessibility**

22. The natural landscape is too steep for full All-Abilities Access to be easily achieved. The new path work can however be barrier free and with a sealed surface. For the most part, gradient would be <8%. Path width would be 1.5-1.8m with passing places. There is good vehicular access to car parks at each end of the proposed paths. The proposed path would be appropriate for ‘Terrain Hopper’ and mechanised wheelchair and potentially for All-Ability Cycling, accessible from the public road. Existing paths are steep but options are suggested to reduce gradients. Path C-G provides a lower grade option or re-alignment of A-B, subject to survey.

23. Access by foot from Callander is at present restricted by: steep (>8%); steps; and poor path surfaces.

24. Future grading, assuming all paths are upgraded, is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>steep</td>
<td>firm</td>
<td>slope</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>0.6km / ½ hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ownership**

25. The land is all FCS owned. Consultation has been positive, but resources for long term adoption require negotiation.
**Consents:**

26. Planning Approval will be required. Specialist surveys may include: a) otter survey (burn / ditch crossing); b) tree survey / tree protection plan; c) bat survey; d) red squirrel survey; e) badger survey. There are no known, mapped archaeological sites are affected.

**Likely timescales:**

- Design – survey, detail, specification, tender – 2-months;
- Planning – 3-months;
- Construction – 2 to 3 months.

**Construction constraints**

27. Bird nesting constraints – 1st April – 31st July would affect felling and disturbance. Construction may have to work out-with this period, although there is usually scope for work practices to be adapted to minimise disturbance.

28. Construction access could be from Callander Crags car park and via FCS forestry access. Co-ordination is needed with FCS harvesting operations.

**Public utilities**

29. The position of utilities should be checked, especially at the adjacent water works and road edge.

**Project beneficiaries**

30. Beneficiaries include:

- Local residents: Crags are a very popular local walking area and the work improves access and reduces constraints of slope on existing paths;
- Mobility impaired: potentially available to Terrain Hopper, mechanised wheelchairs and All-Abilities bikes;
- Tourists: the proposals improves accessibility of surrounding countryside from the town, encouraging a lengthened stay in the town, and making iconic bridge and falls at Bracklinn more accessible. The path would improve access to the countryside;
- Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment, sustaining local businesses;
- Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.

**Partners**

31. Most likely partners include:

- Forestry Commission Scotland (land-owner).

**Delivery**

32. The recommendation is for construction through a conventional construction Contract. There are opportunities for sustaining local employment through the construction stage and for incorporating training to develop rural skills in construction and maintenance.

**Community involvement**

33. There is opportunity for volunteers to construct paths (if aggregate only), but would require skilled supervision and there would be Health and Safety (H&S) considerations. There are also opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance.

**Maintenance / adoption**

34. Agreement needed with FCS.

**Risks**

35. Consents: FCS consent required.

36. Adoption: FCS agreement required.
Health and safety: normal construction risks apply plus tree work.

Indicative Costs

Indicative costs are shown below, based on ‘Paths for All’ (PfA) rates with a 20% mark up. Preliminaries\(^4\) are included at 10%.

Contingencies\(^5\) are included at 10%. VAT is not included, but will apply as an additional 20% to all costs shown. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Fees and consents are costed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-B</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>£ 1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path B-C</td>
<td>Option 1: Up-grade on line</td>
<td>£ 9,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2: Up-grade to new line</td>
<td>£ 24,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path C-D-E</td>
<td>Option 1: New path on desire line</td>
<td>£ 29,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path C-D-F</td>
<td>Option 2: New path direct to car park</td>
<td>£ 33,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path C-G</td>
<td>New path</td>
<td>£ 24,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex vat

Cost options

Combined cost options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>A-B signs</td>
<td>£ 30,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-C no-work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-D-E option 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A-B signs</td>
<td>£ 40,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-C on-line upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-D-E option 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex vat

Consent and design costs

Consent and design fees\(^6\) are estimated as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-E</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 2,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design fees on £60k</td>
<td>£ 4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£ 8,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex vat

---

\(^3\) Paths for All is a partnership of organisations committed to promoting walking for health and the development of multi-use path networks in Scotland

\(^4\) Preliminaries’ are costs attributed to the contractor’s general obligations, general facilities and setup and running costs, “site overheads”. At budget cost estimate stage a % of works cost is included to cover preliminaries.

\(^5\) Contingency is a % added to the works cost to allow for the unforeseen.

\(^6\) At budget estimate stage design fees are included as a % addition to works costs. As the cost goes up the % goes down.
Project 2: Callander Crags Summit-Bracklinn Road

Project Objective
41. This project addresses a short section of improvement to the path that runs NE from the summit of Callander Crags to the Brackland Glen.
42. The ridge walk along the top of the Callander Crags is a superb local low level hill-path, easily accessible from the town and enjoying panoramic views. The continuation of a path NE passed the Boy Scout Memorial provides a link to paths in Brackland Glen, to the Bracklinn Falls and back to town. The existing path is an unconstructed hill-path; rough and rocky.
43. This project would address a small section of the lower descent to the Bracklinn Road, where the path is steep and braided into a number of small paths and there is surface erosion. The proposal would provide a new constructed path to this lower section. There is an option for a small lay-by car park on the public road. The land is privately owned.
44. Note the site has been walked but was not looked at in detail as was not a Project at that time.

Additional benefits
45. The path could also protect upland birch woodland from erosion, and if stock proofing is included, promote regeneration.

Existing situation
46. Path condition is a deterrent to access and is damaging to hillside and woodland.

Constraints
47. Slopes are very steep (>12%) and woodland is vulnerable. To ease the gradient a cleared corridor will be required in the woodland. Land-owner consent will be required. The area is grazed by cattle and poached; any stock proofing would reduce grazing available to the land-owner.

Proposals
48. Map 2 shows proposals. A route would require detailed survey. The path would be a cut-and-fill upland hill path with an aggregate surface. There will be a cleared corridor in the woodland to accommodate re-grading the path. Stock fencing is suggested around the birch woodland, with DDA compliant gates for path access. Stock proofing would avoid conflict between walkers and livestock and would allow woodland regeneration.
49. A lay-by is suggested, cut into the slope and surfaced with bit-mac, as an option.

Signage
50. Directional signage is required at the Brackland Glen end.
Typical views

Path at Brackland Road

Path in woodland

Path in open ground

Accessibility

51. The hillside is very steep and, above this section, has rock steps and steep falls, so accessibility for mobility impaired is limited by natural features. The new section would be routed to moderate gradients but would still be steep ( > 10%). To minimise loss of woodland and construction corridor, path width would probably be restricted to 1.2m.

52. Grading of path from Bracklinn Road to Callander Crags car park:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strenuous</td>
<td>steep</td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>steps</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>1.8km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership

53. Drumdarroch Estates.

Consents:

54. Land-owner/land manager consent and access agreement.

55. Planning Approval will be required. Specialist surveys may include: a) otter survey; b) tree protection plan; c) badger survey possible. No known archaeological sites are directly affected.

Likely timescales:

- Design – survey, detail, specification, tender – 1-months
- Planning – 3-months
- Construction – 1 month

Construction constraints

56. Woodland clearance would be undertaken in winter (Nov – March). Path construction could be undertaken at any time of year but bird nesting constraints – 1st April – 31st July – would affect felling and disturbance within woodland. There may be grazing constraints. Construction access would be from public road.

57. A habitat survey may be needed at the appropriate season to verify any rare plants. Re-routing or transplanting could be considered if issues arise.
Public utilities

58. Check required; especially at road edge.

Project beneficiaries

59. Beneficiaries would include:
   - Local residents: Callander Crags is very popular local walking area and the work would improve access.
   - Tourists: the proposals improves accessibility of surrounding countryside from the town, encouraging lengthened stay in the town, making the iconic Bracklinn Falls more accessible;
   - Natural heritage: path works would define a path route and reduce soil erosion and run-off; fencing, if undertaken, would encourage natural regeneration and spread of upland birch woodland;
   - Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment, sustaining local businesses.
   - Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.

Implementation

60. Recommendation is construction through conventional contract.

61. There are opportunities for sustaining local employment and rural skills development in construction and maintenance.

Community involvement

62. There are opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance.

63. There is opportunity for volunteers to construct paths (if aggregate only), but would require skilled supervision and there would be H&S considerations.

Partnership

64. There is opportunity for partnership with the land-owner with, for instance, Agri-Environmental Schemes for habitat protection fencing and/or Improving Public Access (IPA) funding. If fencing is proposed the land-owner is likely to ask for compensation for loss of grazing, and this may be achieved through a habitat improvement scheme.

Maintenance / adoption

65. Agreement needed with land-owner/manager.

Risks

66. Consents: landowner consent required.

67. Adoption: agreement required.


Indicative Costs

69. Indicative costs are shown below, based on PfA rates with a 20% mark up to allow for inflation and location. Preliminaries are included at 10%. Contingencies are included at 10%. VAT is not included, but applies at 20%. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Costs exclude fees and consents.

70. Stock fencing is identified around the woodland with gates in and out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-B</td>
<td>Path</td>
<td>£16,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option of stock fencing</td>
<td>£10,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car lay-by</td>
<td></td>
<td>£11,319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex vat

71. Further work could be carried out to the path on from here south west wards toward the summit of the Crags to improve drainage and infill soft spots. This is not included.
**Consent and design costs**

72. Consent and design fees are estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16k works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design fees on £16k</td>
<td>£ 2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£ 3,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36k works</strong></td>
<td>Path, layby, fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design fees on £36k</td>
<td>£ 3,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£ 4,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs exclude vat.
Project 3: Little Leny Meadows

Project Objective

73. This project provides all-abilities-access from the NCN 7 Cycle Path west of The Meadows, to the Buchanan of Leny burial enclosure situated on a hillycon at the confluence of the Eas Gobhain and Garbh Usige. The path is close and accessible to Callander town-centre and the public open space at The Meadows. There is an existing desire line path to the graveyard, but the ground is rough and wet. The area is subject to flooding.

74. The graveyard is a Cat C Listed Building and was still used as a cemetery by the Buchanan family to the end of the 18th century. The low gravel hillock upon which the graveyard sits may be the site of a 13th century chapel, reputedly relocated due to river erosion. There may have been a bridge to the chapel over the Eas Gobhain. The enclosure would appear to be 18th century; the earliest memorial plaques date from 1724. The adjacent burial ground seems to date from the 19th century as indicated by the gravestones. The site is bounded by mature oak trees. In the surrounding burial ground are a number of 19th and 20th century gravestones with some contained within enclosures.

75. The meadow is an example of species rich unimproved flood meadow.

76. There are beautiful views of the rivers and the confluence of the rivers and to the hills and Ben Ledi and Callander Crags. The area is one of lowland rural tranquillity.

Additional benefits

77. The path will provide: a) provide improved public access to a site of local historic interest, close and accessible from the town; b) provide all-abilities-access; c) potentially provide access for nature study.

78. An option is considered for a circular route.

79. There is opportunity to tie into local habitat improvement /diversification which may include: a) management of lowland species rich grassland; and b) wetland management. There is opportunity to tie into local cultural heritage interpretation and trails.

Existing situation

80. The meadows are all subject to frequent and prolonged flooding and this is a constraint for access. Floods are anecdotally reported to flow across the area (ie not standing water) and there is risk of erosion.

81. Existing access is rough grassland with some localised erosion. There are short steep slopes at the graveyard. The area may be subject to grazing (sheep and cattle) and is cut for silage. Areas of adjacent meadow are tending to revert to wetland with semi-permanent standing water and reeds.

82. The dismantled Callander-Oban railway, now the NCN 7 cycle path, provides access> NCN 7 is an aggregate path with shallow gradients and on a well-drained causeway. There are ramps down onto the meadow at the access, provide by the railway construction and some dilapidated railway gates. There are mature oak trees at the graveyard.

Constraints

83. As above, the site is subject to flooding. The graveyard is an historic site and listed building. The meadow is of local natural interest. There are mature trees. The area is grazed and/or managed as cut meadow. The graveyard is a Listed Building; the Conservation Area comes to the right bank of the Garbh Usige adjacent to the graveyard. There are short steep slopes up to the graveyard. Access onto the cycle path is restricted to one gateway by the steep embankment. Much of the adjacent meadow is waterlogged with some drainage ditches. A 33kv
overhead cable crosses the meadow. Both rivers are part of the Teith SAC, protected freshwater habitat.

Proposals

84. Map 3 shows proposals.

85. Path ‘A-B-C-D’ is suggested as a 1.5m wide path to the graveyard. It is suggested the existing railway ramp (8%) is used to access the meadow. On the meadow a direct line on the slightly drier margin to wet ground to the west is proposed. At the graveyard a route is required to negotiate the slope with a gradient <8%. A detailed survey is required to plan this and avoid damage to the large root plate of mature trees. Construction using ‘full-tray’ construction, finished surface flush to the meadow to reduce risk of undercutting by flooding.

86. Path surfaces have been considered taking account of construction costs and resilience to flooding. Bitmac is proposed on the basis that, provided edges are protected from undercutting, the surface would be least susceptible to erosion by flooding. To mitigate a potentially urban finish, a spray and chip surface coating of un-coated aggregate could be applied. A whin-dust finish is a cheaper option to construct and may be visually more appropriate to the rural setting, but will require more regular surface dressing to maintain a smooth surface.

87. An area of hard-standing is proposed where agricultural access from the west crosses the path.

88. Path ‘D-E-C’ is an optional circuit around the graveyard.

89. Path E-B is an optional path to provide a circuit. Ground conditions are very wet here. The river edge has some alluvial mounding, but this is wooded. A 2m wide timber board walk without handrail has been costed.

90. The gate at ‘A’ will need to be up-graded to provide a stock proof barrier and a 4m timber farm gate and DDA self-closing pedestrian gate has been included in the costs.

91. Seats and a picnic table are included at the graveyard.

Signage

92. Directional signage is proposed at the NCN 7 junction and the route would be added to directional signage in the Meadows. Hazard signage may be required to highlight risk of flooding. Interpretative signage at the Graveyard would be advantageous, but not included here.

Typical Views

Path access from NCN 7: ramp to the right to be used.

Path across Meadow on desire line; wetland to the right.

---

7 Full tray= excavate at least 15cm down through topsoil and construct the path back up so that it is at ground level, thereby avoiding the path affecting flow of flood water.
River side path around outside of graveyard.

Riverside path around outside of graveyard.

Potential loop through wetland, requiring boardwalk.

### Accessibility

93. Access to the path by NCN 7 is, in principle, all-abilities-access, although in reality is restricted by: a) some surface wear on the original whin dust aggregate; b) distance from car parks at the Meadows (520m); and c) some local constraints in The Meadows. Access from the car park at the A821 is 1.3km to the west.

94. The new works would be all barrier free and all-abilities.

### Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy/All Ability</td>
<td>gentle</td>
<td>smooth</td>
<td>gates</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>0.3km / ¼ hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

95. Drumardoch Estate^a^

### Consents:

96. Land-owner/land manager consent and access agreement.

97. Planning Approval will be required. Listed Building consent may be required for alterations to the setting of a listed building. Specialist surveys may include: a) otter survey; b) tree protection plan; c) habitat survey of meadow. The works will involve excavation into a historic site at the graveyard; a watching brief may be required by an archaeologist during construction.

98. There is Japanese Knotweed within the meadow. A survey and risk assessment may be required and careful construction management if in proximity to the works.

99. The works are all within the less than 200-year flood return and will require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). Of particular concern will be avoidance of diffuse pollution during construction and keeping of ‘hands-off’ flood retention areas.

### Likely timescales:

- Design – survey, detail, specification, tender – 2-months. Surveys may be season dependent.
- Planning – 3-months
- Construction:
  - Path A-B-C-D-E-C approx. 2 months;
  - Path E-C approx. 3-months.

---

^a^ anecdotal
Construction constraints

100. Construction in summer to reduce flood risk is required. There may be other habitat, bird nesting constraints and farming constraints.

Public utilities

101. Check required; the meadow is crossed by an overhead 33kv cable and precautions will be required during construction.

Project beneficiaries

102. Beneficiaries would include:
- Local residents: provides a highly accessible local walk and access to a site of local interest for cultural history, natural heritage and scenic value.
- Tourists: the proposal improves accessibility of surrounding countryside from town, encouraging lengthened stay in the town.
- Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment and sustaining local businesses.
- Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.

Implementation

103. Recommendation is for construction through conventional contract.

104. There are opportunities for sustaining local employment and rural skills development in construction and maintenance.

Community involvement

105. There are opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance. There is opportunity for volunteers to construct paths (if aggregate only) and boardwalks, but would require skilled supervision and there would be H&S considerations.

Partnership

106. There is opportunity for partnership with the land-owner and partnership with, for instance Agri-Environmental Schemes for habitat protection fencing and Improving Public Access (IPA) funding.

Maintenance / adoption

107. Agreement needed with land-owner/manager. A Bitmac path should have minimum of 15 years use before re-surfacing. A whin path would probably require re-dressing after 5-years to retain a smooth surface. Re-dressing with whin is a cheaper and simpler process than re-surfacing with bitmac, but required more often.

Risks

- Consents: landowner consent required.
- Adoption: agreement required.
- Health and safety: normal construction risks, with additional constraint of flooding.

Indicative Costs

Indicative costs are shown below, based on PfA rates with a 20% mark up to allow for inflation and location. Preliminaries are included at 10%. Contingencies are included at 10%. VAT is not included but applies at 20%. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Fees and consents are shown separately:
Ex vat

108. If the meadow is to be grazed with cattle, there could be merit in providing a fenced path corridor. This would: a) improve public safety; b) reduce risk of nuisance; and c) protect path surfaces. It could provide an un-grazed corridor with habitat interest. However, fencing would add clutter and detract from the open nature of the meadow and would complicate access and add costs, and reduce grazing available to the farmer. Fences can be susceptible to damage during flooding. A temporary electric fence during periods of grazing might be considered. Fence costs have not been included.

109. With path ‘E-B’ the board walk could be a beautiful feature, built to a sinuous curve, with the Garbh Uisge on one side and the flood meadow on the other. However, there would be Health and Safety considerations with uncontrolled access during periods of flood. A boardwalk would have a life span of around 15 years before maintenance may be required. Use of recycled plastics would increase longevity. There would however be a maintenance requirement to clean decking periodically and to safety check after flooding and for removal of flood debris. The option of a path at the river’s edge would have similar issues regarding flooding and would incur tree loss along the river bank.

**Consent and design costs**

110. Consent and design fees are estimated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-B-C-D</td>
<td>Path – spray and chip on bitmac</td>
<td>£35,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Path – whin dust on aggregate</td>
<td>£24,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path D-E-C</td>
<td>Path (whin)</td>
<td>£22,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path E-B</td>
<td>Path (whin) &amp; boardwalk</td>
<td>£103,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 24k works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-D</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design fees on £24k</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£6,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 149k works

| All paths | Planning consent                           | £1,181  |
|           | Design fees on £149k                        | £9,000  |
|           | Survey costs                               | £3,850  |
|           | Total                                      | £14,031 |

Costs exclude vat.
Project 4: Leny Woods

Project Objective

111. The specific path projects considered here is the provision of a link from Leny Woods to the A84(T) at Corriechrombie Bridge. This would provide an alternative off-road path link from the existing FCS car park at Leny Wood to the access to the Ben Ledi hill path and to Loch Lubnaig. In addition, the path would be a very attractive walk in its own right, passing through the Pass of Leny and experiencing the transition of Lowland to Upland. There is a local network of existing paths in the steeply sloping Leny Woods and the proposed path would add to the network.

112. When the proposed pedestrian bridge is built across the Falls of Leny, linked to a proposed expansion of the Leny Wood FCS car park, the project will provide a useful circular walk and complement the flagship project of the Partnership Scheme.

113. Leny Woods is at the Highland Fault and has dramatic crags and steep hillside. Within Leny Woods there is a significant amount of ancient upland oak woodland on the lower slopes and areas of upland birch, in addition to mixed conifer and areas of clear fell. The wood has a rich cultural heritage with numerous historic sites identified as being related to 18th century timber industry. The Pass of Leny has been a historic route for thousands of years. Part of the path used by this project is probably on the line of an earlier long-established route.

114. Although largely in woodland, there are specific locations where there are magnificent views, both SE to Callander and then NW to Ben Ledi and the Highlands.

115. Note the site has been walked only once and requires detailed survey and options appraisal.

Additional benefits

116. The path will provide: a) improved public access through a site of local historic and natural interest; b) unique views; c) opportunity for a new circular route. There is opportunity to tie into local habitat improvement/diversification including management of oak woodland. There is opportunity to tie into local cultural heritage interpretation.

Existing situation

117. Leny Woods is steeply sloping with crags and pockets of wetland. FCS built a network of paths around 5-years ago at the time of harvesting, with some forwarder tracks now being used as paths, and some purpose built recreational access paths. The proposed path uses a purpose built path initially in climbing NW from the existing FCS car park, then a section of long-established path before forming a new path across steep rocky and heavily wooded hillside.

Constraints

118. Conditions for path construction are not easy.
   - The existing FCS path is well built, but steep and a typical soil reversal path with a rough surface;
   - Beyond the FCS path the existing long established path is exceptionally beautiful, but steep and rough. Up-grading risks loss of quality unless undertaken with great care;
   - The line of the new path is very steep and wooded:
     - A constructed path will risk a wide corridor necessitating tree loss and risking possible slope instability;
     - Steepest sections cross slopes above the A84(T) with potential constraints on working practice during construction;
     - The section adjacent to the A84(T) at Corriechrombie crosses boggy ground;

Note the site has been walked only once and requires detailed survey and options appraisal.
Lower section of this path passes through wind-thrown larch that requires removal before path construction could proceed;  
- Route requires hazardous tree risk assessment;  
- Larch within Ardchullarie is due for felling in the next 10-years[?], requiring forwarder road access from the north;  
- Larch may be susceptible to Phytophthora ramorum (‘Ramorum’), with access restrictions and felling requirements;  
- The path will involve an A84(T) crossing and there will be constraints on sightlines and pedestrian refuge;  
- The works are within Ancient Woodland; tree loss should be avoided if possible. Habitats affected may include Red Squirrel, Badger and Bats, as well as important trees.  

- Historic sites may be directly affected.  
- Construction access will be restricted.

**Proposals**

119. Map 4 shows proposals.  

120. Path ‘A-B’ is an up-grade of the existing FCS path, consisting of vegetation clearance, surface scrape and type 1 blinded by whin-dust. At ‘B’ there is a superb viewpoint; a seat could be located here.

121. Path ‘B-C’ is an existing hill path, part constructed, part desire line; steep in places but largely traversing the slope, with a steep drop below. Passes historic sites identified in earlier FCS Archaeological survey. The path leads to a sharp ridge within Scots Pine woodland. From here the existing path is a desire line and continues uphill to the NE. The proposed new path starts here. There are good views to the hills to the NW. Work to this path should be undertaken with care, using ‘light-touch’ Upland Path techniques, working by hand, focussed on preparing the path for future increased use.

122. Path ‘C-D’ is the new path. There are two route options shown on plan; the western, lower route has easier ground for the most part and would be the most likely to be used; the eastern, higher route is across very steep hillside, but less likely to be affected by proximity to the A84(T). At this stage there has not been resource to survey the routes in detail. It is proposed that an aggregate hill-path be built, largely hand dug into the slope and working around significant trees using site won stone for water stops and occasional steps. At ‘D’ there would be a ‘floated’ construction over bog. There would be alterations to the roadside boundary to accommodate access and provide a refuge at the road edge. Sightlines at the Corriechrombie access road are reasonable for a road crossing, but the road is 60- mph and at the southern end of a straight and often fast section. Transport Scotland consent would be needed.

**Signage**

123. Directional signage is proposed at The FCS Leny Wood Car Park and at Corriechrombie. Way-markers are suggested at path junctions. Hazard signage to warning signage may be required to highlight risk of steep slopes and A84(T) crossing. Interpretative signage in the woodland at viewpoints and historic and natural heritage sites would be advantageous but not included in costs.

---

9 Transport Scotland were asked to comment, but no feedback received.
Path A-B: existing forestry path

Path B-C: existing hill path

Views toward Callander and over the Pass of Leny from 'B'

Path C-D – lower option

Path C-D – lower option: typical slopes above A84(T).

Views from ‘C’

Path entrance at Corriechrombie, ‘D’
### Accessibility

124. The paths would be ‘hill-path’ in character with slopes up to 30% in places and steep side slopes, restricted by natural constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strenuous</td>
<td>steep</td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>short/steps</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>1.1km / ¾ hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ownership

125. FCS own north to the fence line on Tom Bheithe, then ownership is with Drumardoch Estate.

### Consents:

126. Land-owner/ land manager consent and access agreements required.

127. Planning Approval will be required. Specialist surveys may include: a) otter survey; b) tree protection plan; c) habitat survey; d) red-squirrel; e) bats; f) archaeological survey; g) tree protection plan and tree survey.

128. The works are will require a Trunk Road crossing with Transport Scotland consent. There will also be a need for risk assessment for work above the A84(T) and requirements for safety measures. Lane closure / traffic lights are not included in the costs below and liaison with Transport Scotland is required. Costs will depend on duration of traffic control.

### Likely timescales:

129. Lead in timetable could be as follows. This will be affected by Ardchullarie Estate programme for woodland management of windthrow and standing timber:

- Design: survey, detail, specification, tender: 3-months. Surveys may be season dependent;
- Planning: 3-months;
- Construction: Path A-B-C-D approx. 4 months.

### Construction constraints

130. Steep and potentially unstable ground above the A84(T) within woodland are construction constraints.

131. Nesting and breeding bird constraints on tree clearance and working in proximity would restrict works March to July. Path construction best in summer to limit issues with wet ground. Programme will be affected by woodland management programme of Ardchullarie Estate.

### Public utilities

132. Check required, especially at A84(T) crossing.

### Project beneficiaries

133. Beneficiaries include:

- Local residents: provides a highly accessible local walk and access to a site of local interest for cultural history, natural heritage and scenic value.
- Tourists: proposals improve accessibility of surrounding countryside, encouraging lengthened stay in the town;
- Provides an alternative route to Ben Ledi – though capacity for heavy use would be limited;
- Education: provides access to local to local historic and natural heritage interest;
- Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment and sustaining local businesses;
- Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.
Implementation

134. Recommendation is construction through conventional contract, using a contractor experienced in hill path construction. There are opportunities for sustaining local employment and rural skills development in construction and maintenance.

Community involvement

135. There are opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance.
136. There is the option for volunteer construction, but would require a significant input and skilled supervision.
137. There is opportunity for partnership with the land-owner, for instance Agri-Environmental Schemes for habitat protection fencing and Improving Public Access (IPA) funding.

Maintenance / adoption

138. Agreement needed with land-owner/manager.

Risks

- Consents: landowner consent required.
- Adoption: agreement required.
- Health and safety:
  - Normal construction risks, with additional constraint of remote working and steep slopes and proximity to A84(T);
  - Risks of falling trees will continue and require risk assessment and management;
  - User risks associated with a steep upland path;
  - User risks associated with A84(T) crossing.

Indicative Costs

139. Indicative costs are shown below, based on Paths for All rates with a 20% mark up to allow for inflation and location. Preliminaries are included at 10%. Contingencies are included at 10%. VAT is not included but applies at 20%. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Fee and consents costs are shown separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-B</td>
<td>Up-grade existing</td>
<td>£ 8,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path B-C</td>
<td>Upgrade of existing</td>
<td>£11,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path C-D</td>
<td>New hill-path</td>
<td>£47,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex vat

140. Rates for this type of work vary greatly and are only proven by tendering. No allowance is made for Traffic Control on the A84(T). Assessment is based on one site walkover, but sufficient for this stage.

Consent and design costs

141. Consent and design fees are estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68k works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A-D</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A-E</td>
<td>Design fees on £68k</td>
<td>£ 6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£ 12,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs exclude vat.
Project 5: Poetry path

Project Objective

142. The proposal links the two car parks located on the A84(T) on the east shore of Loch Lubnaig with a shore-side path. There is no existing access to the loch shore and the road is not a feasible walking route. Topography and forestry restricted access above the road. Both car parks are popular for sight-seeing; the northern car park has a small café, toilets and camping areas. The proposed path seeks, ideally, to provide an all-abilities path between these car parks so that people, who may not otherwise have access to the wilder hills, can experience the qualities of the loch-side location.

143. Views from the shore feature vistas up and down Loch Lubnaig and to the mass of Ben Ledi. The car parks have been recently upgraded by the LLTNPA Three Lochs Project with high quality design and materials and are effective in creating a positive image to road side facilities. In addition the southern car park was selected for one of the Scenic Routes project promoted by the Scottish Government to enhance the visitor experience of Scotland’s landscape by creating innovatively designed viewpoints in selected locations in areas of outstanding scenery.

144. The location has strong associations with literature and poetry, inspired by the landscape, and the path will provide a spine for artwork and interpretation that will be developed around these themes.

145. The shoreline is a restricted corridor with physical restrictions which will increase costs over and above an ordinary all-abilities path. Options on surface material are presented, but there is a base level of cost that is not affected by path surface, so costs remain high. An option for providing access paths at north and south ends, with the beach used for walking between is presented as the lowest cost option, but with restricted accessibility.

146. The site has only been walked once. Detailed surveys will be required before feasibility design could be developed.

Additional benefits

147. The path will provide: a) improved public access to the loch shore, with potential for all-abilities access; b) unique views; c) opportunity to tie into local cultural heritage interpretation.

148. Although not part of the CLP Scheme, there are opportunities for future path links , including, from Leny Wood and Callander and onto the hills east of Loch Lubnaig. In this respect the proposal provides a key link in an aspirational network.

Existing situation

149. The foreshore is a narrow band of largely wooded ground between the A84(T) and the loch edge. At the north end of the strip the corridor is open woodland with natural undulations and areas of wetland. Further south the road is elevated above the loch and there is a very narrow corridor between steep wooded slopes below the road and a shallow sloping beach foreshore. There is a short section of rip-rap rock infill below the road which is a restriction to access along the shore. There are a number of burns issuing to the loch. The loch level inundates parts of the foreshore along the path route. There is no formal existing access, though people do walk along the beach and there are desire line paths.

Constraints

150. Conditions for path construction are not easy.
- The corridor is susceptible to flooding;
- Space is limited for path construction;
- Slopes at the southern car park are steep;
- Existing rock infill impedes access;
- Mature broadleaf woodland is affected;
• The loch is sensitive habitat, part of the Teith SAC;
• Construction access will be restricted.

Proposals

151. Map 5 shows proposals. A number of options are proposed to explore cost and access options. The options have been costed in a following section, but drawings for each option have not been prepared:

• **Option 1**: all-abilities-access with a whin dust path, 1.8m wide for maximum comfort; boardwalk over wetland; infill into loch below existing rip-rap to allow easy access around obstruction. All beach sections are constructed at the top of the beach but may be occasionally inundated and so have protective rip-rap to the loch-side edge of the path. Picnic benches and seats are included along the path;
• **Option 2**: as above but with bound surface – ie spray and chip on Bitmac – to improve longevity;
• **Option 3**: as option 1, but with the path diverted inland onto drier ground but close to the A84(T) and no boardwalk;
• **Option 4**: width reduced to 1m to 1.2m to reduce costs; reduced furniture; access at the existing rip-rap uses the existing narrow berm on the rock slope, a narrow and restricted route;
• **Option 5**: reduced width 0.8m to 1m; smaller bridges replaced with culverts; reduced furniture; constricted path at existing rip-rap, as option 5;
• **Option 6**: enables access to the foreshore at north and south, but the rest of the route would be walked on the natural foreshore when loch level allows. This is minimal impact and cost, but cannot provide all-abilities access.

152. The works are divided into sections:

• A-B: path on wooded foreshore;
• B-C: boardwalk at loch edge over wetland;
• C-D: rock cut below a small hillock at the loch edge;
• A-D: optional route set back from the loch avoiding board walk and rock cut;
• D-E: path through undulating open alder woodland;
• E-I: path shoe-horned in between steep wooded slope below the road and the loch edge. In flood conditions the path would be liable to inundation and wave action. Rock rip-rap protection or similar is included;
• F-G: negotiates existing rip-rap rock infill below the A84(T). There is a narrow ledge in the rip-rap low on the slope, probably formed for walking access. Option 1, 2 and 3 creates new rock fill onto the beach to form 3m wide berm for the proposed path. Option 4 and 5 uses an existing ledge in the infill to create a narrow path here. Option 6 assumes walking on the beach when loch level allows;
• H-I: negotiates a steep wooded slope to the existing car park.

153. Timber seats and picnic tables are proposed at nodes along the route, with provision reduced in options 4, 5 and 6.

154. There are six watercourse crossing. Timber bridges are proposed in options 1-4, with wide decks for maximum access. In option 4 bridge widths are the minimum required for mobility impaired access. Culverts are proposed for the smaller crossings in Option 5. In option 6 three bridges of 1m wide deck are proposed in the northern part.

155. A whin path is recommended due to rural character of the location. A bound surface, such as bitmac or resin bound aggregates, may be more resilient to flooding and provide greater longevity however, there is risk of wave damage and a bound material would be expensive for periodic repairs.
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Signage

156. Directional signage is proposed at each end of the path. Interpretative signage and artworks at points along the path would give additionality, but are not included in cost estimate.

Path A-B: access at north car park

Path A-B: wetland at loch edge - proposed board walk at loch edge.

Path B-C: rock cut around base of small hillock

Path A-D: option to route across wet scrub further inland, close to A84(T)

Path D-E: open woodland on alluvial fan

Path D-E – burn crossings

Path E-H: path would need to run at toe of bank with some tree loss and occasional inundation
Path F-G: existing rip-rap infill to be negotiated by either extending the toe of the slope in rip-rap at c. 1m above loch level (options 1, 2, 3) or clearing and regulating a rough existing berm on the slope to provide a narrow path (options 4, 5)

Path G-H slope up to southern car park to be negotiated

### Accessibility

157. Access will be subject to flooding and appropriate signage is required. The table below summarises general accessibility, subject to survey and design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Easy - Access for all</td>
<td>gentle</td>
<td>firm</td>
<td>Boardwalk Bridges</td>
<td>Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options 4</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Gentle; short sections</td>
<td>firm</td>
<td>Boardwalk Bridges</td>
<td>Wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 5**

| Easy | Gentle; short sections | firm | Boardwalk Bridges | Narrow | 1.1km / ¾ hr |

**Option 6**

| Moderate | Gentle; rough sections | moderate | Boardwalk Bridges | Narrow | 1.1km / ¾ hr |

### Ownership

158. Drumardoch Estates.

### Consents:

159. Land-owner/land manager consent and access agreements required. Adoption requires to be resolved and liabilities.

160. Planning Approval will be required. Specialist surveys may include: a) otter survey; b) tree protection plan; c) habitat survey; d) red squirrel; e) CMS and management of diffuse pollution during construction.

161. CARS licence for bridges 1, 2 and 3. GBR will apply to other watercourse crossing.

162. The works will require consultation with Transport Scotland regarding work affecting support of the A84(T) and construction access. There could be consideration to periodic lane closure to allow construction access for import of materials.

---

10 The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) - CARS licence
11 GBR: General Binding Agreement (part of CARS for smaller burn crossings)
Likely timescales:

- Design: survey, detail, specification, tender: 3-months. Surveys may be season dependent;
- Planning: 3-months;
- Construction: 6 to 9-months.

Construction constraints

163. The route is restricted and construction access is difficult. Construction access will affect one or both car parks with potential conflict with public use, especially in peak times. Nesting and breeding bird constraints on tree clearance and working in proximity would restrict works March to July. Path construction in summer would usually limit flooding issues but conflict with tourist and habitat pressures.

Public utilities

164. Check required.

Project beneficiaries

165. Beneficiaries include:
- Local residents: provides an accessible local walk and access to a site of local interest and scenic value;
- Tourists: the proposals improve accessibility of surrounding countryside;
- Education: provides access to local to local historic and natural heritage interest;
- Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment and sustaining local businesses;
- Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.

Implementation

166. Construction through conventional contract, using a contractor experienced in minor engineering construction and site management. Opportunities for sustaining local employment and rural skills development in construction and maintenance. Opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance.

Partnership

167. There is opportunity for partnership with:
- Land-owner, for instance Agri-Environmental Schemes for habitat protection fencing and Improving Public Access (IPA) funding;
- Transport Scotland: tree management (Trunk Road Landscape Management Plan in the past included ‘View from the Road’ selective tree clearance and this could be integrated into the project);
- Scottish Government / Creative Spaces / Visit Scotland: art interpretation.

Maintenance / adoption

168. Agreement needed with land-owner/manager.

Risks

- Costs;
- Consents: landowner consent required;
- Adoption: agreement required;
- Health and safety: normal construction risks, with additional constraint of remote working and steep slopes and proximity to A84(T) and loch.

Indicative Costs

169. Indicative costs are shown below, based on Paths for All rates with a 20% mark up to allow for inflation and location. Preliminaries
are included at 10%. Contingencies are included at 10%. VAT is not included but applies at 20%. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Fee and consent costs are shown separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-I</td>
<td>Option 1: Optimum scheme, whin path, 1.8m, plus boardwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A-I</td>
<td>Option 2: Optimum scheme, bound path (eg shray &amp; chip on Bitmac), 1.8m wide, plus boardwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A-I</td>
<td>Option 3: Optimum scheme, whin path, inland route with no boardwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A-I</td>
<td>Option 4: Reduced scheme, whin path 1.2-1.5m, no boardwalk; reduced furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A-I</td>
<td>Option 5: Minimal scheme: whin path 1m, no boardwalk, culverts in lieu of 3m bridges; reduced furniture. Access is adequate but restricted for wheelchairs and mechanised all-abilities access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path A- E &amp; H-I</td>
<td>Option 6: whin; 1m wide; foreshore sections are walked along the beach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

170. Rates for this type of work vary greatly and are only proven by tendering. No allowance is made for Traffic Control on the A84(T).

171. The recommendation is Option 1 with maximum accessibility, developed as a partnership project or potentially phased. Onto this could be developed proposals for interpretation and / or art interventions.

Consent and design costs

172. Consent and design fees are estimated below. Fees include a civil engineering input into bridge and rip-rap works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 6</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design fees on £84k</td>
<td>£ 8,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£ 13,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All paths</td>
<td>Design fees on £200k</td>
<td>£ 12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£ 19,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs exclude VAT.
Project 6: Ben Gullipen

Project Objective

173. The existing track that leads to the summit of Ben Gullipen ends at the existing telecommunications masts. Here views are restricted and a short desire line path has developed to the ridge where the best views are available. The project would up-grade the desire line to a constructed all-abilities path to the viewpoint. An option for a longer path that avoids passing the masts is suggested.

174. At the viewpoint it is suggested that a dry-stane shelter is formed to make a feature and house panoramic interpretative information, similar to photograph below:

175. Ben Gullipen is a popular viewpoint and walk from Callander on well-established paths and tracks. Views from the summit are spectacular.

176. Note the site has been walked but was not looked at in detail and an additional visit is needed to verify costs and layouts.

Additional benefits

177. The path will provide: a) Excellent views over Callander and the hills; b) Opportunities for landscape and nature interpretation; c) Opportunities for improved access for mobility impaired visitors.

178. Regarding the latter, the hill as existing is accessible to, for example Terrain Hopper and all abilities bikes, but the actual view is not due to fences and rough ground. It could also be feasible in the future to allow some vehicles up to the masts and this would allow more severely impaired people to also have access to the view by a short section of path.

Existing situation

179. As above access to the masts is generally good on existing tracks. To the viewpoint ground is wet, boggy and restricted by fence.

Constraints

180. Physical constraints of peaty ground and negotiating local steep slopes and stock fences.

Proposals

181. Map 6 shows proposals and options.

- A-B is an up-grade of the existing desire line;
- C-B is an option to take people away from the masts.
- A-B or C-B could be built or both to provide a loop. Or a wider loop could be built for a more extensive path.

**Signage**

182. Directional signage could be provided at A or C.

183. The path should be able to be all-abilities standards, subject to survey. The location is however not all-abilities accessible due to; a) distance from road; b) steep and sustained gradients; and c) rough surfaces. Terrain Hopper, all terrain wheel chairs and all terrain bikes could get to the location and use the path, subject to an issue with an existing gate being resolved. As above vehicular access could, in principle, be arranged for mobility impaired with land-owner consent.

184. Future grading, of proposed path as below. Access to hilltop will remain Moderate, as above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>gentle</td>
<td>firm</td>
<td>gate</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ownership**

185. Landownership is not confirmed; part Cambusmore Estate.

Involvement of the telecommunication companies should be checked re. access way leaves / safety zones etc.

**Consents:**

186. Planning Approval will be required. There are no known archaeological sites are affected. Habitat walkover survey may be required for a new path.
Likely timescales:

- Design – survey, detail, specification, tender – 1-month
- Planning – 3-months
- Construction – 1 months

Construction constraints


Public utilities

188. Check required; especially at mast.

Project beneficiaries

189. Beneficiaries include:

- Local residents: Ben Gullipen is a very popular local walking area and the work improves access;
- Mobility impaired: potentially available to Terrain Hopper, mechanised wheelchair and All-Abilities bikes would be provided with equal access;
- Tourists: the proposals improve accessibility of surrounding countryside from town, encouraging lengthened stay in the town;
- Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment and sustaining local businesses;
- Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.

Partners

- Landowner through Agri-Environmental Schemes;
- Telecommunications companies sponsorship.

Delivery

190. Recommendation is construction through conventional contract. Opportunities for sustaining local employment and rural skills development in construction and maintenance. Opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance. There is opportunity for volunteers to construct paths but would require skilled supervision and there would be H&S considerations.

Maintenance / adoption

191. Agreement needed.

Risks

- Consents: Landowner consent required.
- Adoption: agreement required.
- Health and safety: normal construction risks.

Indicative Costs

192. Indicative costs are shown below, based on Paths for All rates with a 20% mark up to allow for inflation and location. Preliminaries are included at 10%. Contingencies are included at 10%. VAT is not included by applies at 20%. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Fees and consents are costed separately. Routes A-B and C-B have not been walked yet so cost is provisional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-B</td>
<td>Whin dust</td>
<td>£ 6,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path C-B</td>
<td>Whin dust</td>
<td>£ 13,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint cairn</td>
<td>Dyke</td>
<td>£ 5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex vat

Consent and design costs

193. Consent and design fees are estimated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Path A-B</strong></td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design fees on £7k</td>
<td>£ 2,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£ 2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All paths</td>
<td>Design fees on £25k</td>
<td>£ 3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£ 3,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs exclude vat.
Project 7: Callander Town Centre to Callander Crags car park

Project Objective

194. To upgrade the existing footpaths from Callander town centre and the Callander Crags car park, improving linkages to the Crags, Brackland Glen and countryside beyond. Existing paths are steep, poorly surfaced and poorly signposted.

195. In May 2017 it was agreed to include this path in the Stage 2 Projects submission. The site has been walked but was not looked at in detail and proposals are indicative.

Additional benefits

196. The path will provide an improved linkage to the Crags from the town, improving day-to-day walking access for local residents, improving local quality of life and encouraging recreational walking, as well as increasing accessibility to the crags for tourists and potentially increasing attraction of the town and promoting lengthened stay.

Existing situation

197. The path was added late so has become referred to as path A to Z, with A being the FCS car park within Callander Crags woodland and Z being North Church Street. The path has been sub-divided: A-X being the path from the FCS car park down to the edge of the woodland; X-Y being the path from the woodland edge to Ancaster Road; and Y-Z the path from Ancaster Road to North Church Street.

198. A-X is a steep and muddy path with areas of waterlogging and exposed tree roots. There are a couple of ditch crossings.

199. X-Y is a constructed path with timber sleeper steps and ramps within a grassy corridor between houses. Natural gradients are steep-over 8%.

200. Y-Z is a bitmac path parallel to the NCN 7 cycle path climbing steeply from the North Church Street. From there into the town the walking route follows the road-side pavements top Main Street.

Constraints

201. At present, the Callander Crags woodland is hard to find from the town centre with poor signage. Paths into the woodland are steep, poorly surfaced and poorly signed. Within the woodland the path is rough and muddy and poorly drained; watercourse crossings are ad-hoc and dilapidated. Climbing to the woodland edge there steps that form a barrier and are in poor condition and slippery. The lower sections of the path, below Ancaster Road, are urban in character though the path is steep and narrow and with some dilapidation of the surface.

202. The natural steep slopes are a constraint on accessibility added to by steps and poor surfaces. The road crossing at Ancaster Road is a minor hazard.

Proposals

203. The objective is to up-grade access, however a full all-abilities path is restricted by the natural gradient and constraints on space available for re-alignment to ease gradients. The proposal will therefore remove the main barriers to access; will widen and improve walking surface; and provide handrails and rest points.

204. Map 7 shows proposals, including:

- Path A-X: would be re-constructed as a 1.8m wide whin-dust path within the woodland. The path will follow the existing route and will be part ‘no-dig’\(^\text{12}\) in order to protect shallow tree roots. Drainage will be provided;

\(^{12}\) No-dig= path built up from existing ground rather than excavated into the ground as is normally done.
Path X-Y: would be reconstructed with steps removed and path realigned to attempt to reduce gradients. Allowances are included for creating a zig-zag path although this would be subject to survey and detailed design. Drainage and handrail will be provided. Due to the slope and urban setting a bit-mac surface is proposed. At the road crossing on Ancaster Road there would be a pedestrian safety barrier and drop kerbs installed.

Path Y-Z: would widen and re-surface the existing path with a handrail to ease access.

- Seats are included as rest points along the route.

**Signage**

205. Directional signage would be provided at Main Street, North Church Street, Ancaster Road and FCS car park.

**Accessibility**

206. The natural landscape is too steep for full All-Abilities Access to be achieved. The new path work can however be barrier free and with a sealed surface. For the most part, gradient would be 8-12%. Path width would be 1.5-1.8m. The proposed path would be appropriate for ‘Terrain Hopper’ and mechanised wheelchair.

207. Future accessibility grading, assuming all paths are upgraded, is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>steep</td>
<td>firm</td>
<td>slope</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>0.7km / ½ hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ownership**

208. The land is assumed to be all Stirling Council owned. This would require confirmation.

**Consents:**

209. Planning Approval will be required.

210. Specialist surveys may include: a) otter survey (burn / ditch crossing); b) tree survey / tree protection plan; c) bat survey; d) red squirrel survey; e) badger survey. No known, mapped archaeological sites are affected.

**Likely timescales:**

- Design – survey, detail, specification, tender – 2-months;
- Planning – 3-months;
- Construction – 3 months.

**Construction constraints**

211. Bird nesting constraints – 1st April – 31st July may affect work with the woodland.

212. Construction access could be from Callander Crags car park and/or from Ancaster Road and North Church Street.

**Public utilities**

213. The position of utilities should be checked throughout.

---

13 Ancaster Square to FCS Callander Woods car park
Path A-X
Path would be re-built to existing alignment.

Path X-Y
A new path would be built with steps removed. A detailed survey and design would be required to seek to reduce gradients to minimum feasible.

Path Y-Z
Left hand path is the cycle path; right hand path is the footpath which would be upgraded.

Project beneficiaries
214. Beneficiaries include:
- Local residents: The Crags are a very popular local walking area and the work improves access and reduces constraints of slope on existing paths;
- Mobility impaired: potentially available to Terrain Hopper, mechanised wheelchairs and All-Abilities bikes;
- Tourists: the proposals improves accessibility of surrounding countryside from the town, encouraging a lengthened stay in the town, and making iconic bridge and falls at Bracklinn more accessible. The path would improve access to the countryside;
- Employment: construction provides opportunities for local employment, sustaining local businesses;
- Training: path works provides opportunities for rural skills training – eg SVQ Environmental Conservation.

Partners
215. Most likely partners include:
- Stirling Council (land-owner).

Delivery
216. The recommendation is for construction through a conventional construction Contract. There are opportunities for sustaining local employment through the construction stage and for incorporating training to develop rural skills in construction and maintenance.

Community involvement
217. There is opportunity for volunteers to construct paths (if aggregate only), but would require skilled supervision and there would be Health and Safety (H&S) considerations. There are also
opportunities for community involvement in path inspections and maintenance.

**Maintenance / adoption**

218. Agreement needed with Stirling Council (SC).

**Risks**

220. Adoption: SC agreement required.
221. Health and safety: normal construction risks apply plus tree work.

**Indicative Costs**

222. Indicative costs are shown below, based on ‘Paths for All’ (PfA)\(^{14}\) rates with a 20% mark up. Preliminaries\(^{15}\) are included at 10%. Contingencies\(^{16}\) are included at 10%. VAT is not included, but will apply as an additional 20% to all costs shown. Costs are indicative prior to survey and design. Fees and consents are costed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-X</td>
<td>Woodland path</td>
<td>£ 18,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Y</td>
<td>Path re-build from woods to Ancaster Rd</td>
<td>£ 38,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-Z</td>
<td>Path up-grade Ancaster Rd to North Church St</td>
<td>£ 12,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 70,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 7,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 7,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ex vat</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 84,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consent and design costs**

223. Consent and design fees\(^{17}\) are estimated as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path A-Z</td>
<td>Planning consent</td>
<td>£ 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design fees on £80k</td>
<td>£ 5,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey costs</td>
<td>£ 1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 7,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex vat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Paths for All is a partnership of organisations committed to promoting walking for health and the development of multi-use path networks in Scotland

15 ‘Preliminaries’ are costs attributed to the contractor’s general obligations, general facilities and setup and running costs, “site overheads”. At budget cost estimate stage a % of works cost is included to cover preliminaries.

16 Contingency is a % added to the works cost to allow for the unforeseen.

---

17 At budget estimate stage design fees are included as a % addition to works costs. As the cost goes up the % goes down.