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1. Introduction

1.1 Background to the Consultation

A consultative draft of the Scottish Canals Heritage Strategy 2013–28 was issued on 19 November 2012 for a period of nine weeks. It is available at: www.scottishcanals.co.uk/draft-heritage-strategy. It invited views on our 25-year vision, long-term aims for Scotland’s canal heritage and a set of guiding principles. We also sought views on a series of 20 objectives intended to form our heritage priorities for the next 5 years.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was undertaken on the Strategy to meet the requirements of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. Views were also sought on the findings of the assessment which were set out in the Environmental Report that accompanied the draft strategy.

The consultation closed on 21 January 2013 and 38 written responses have been received, 16 from organisations and 22 individuals. You may request copies of the responses for which permission to publish has been granted by contacting us on 0141 354 7548 or heritage@scottishcanals.co.uk. We will arrange to send them to you by post or email. Alternatively, you can make an appointment to consult them in person in Scottish Canals’ Glasgow office.

1.2 Report Objectives

This report first explains the background to the consultation and the methods used to engage people in developing the heritage strategy.

Next, the written responses and public meeting discussions are summarised, the views expressed are analysed and the key issues identified. The report then sets out the substantive changes that will be made to the consultative draft as a result of these issues and why.

In conclusion we explain how and when the strategy will be finalised. The organisations and individuals who provided written comments are listed in Annex A.

1.3 Consultation Methods

The Draft Heritage Strategy was issued for public consultation on 19 November 2012. Originally this was planned to close on 14 January 2013 after a period of eight weeks. The deadline was extended to 21 January to give people more time to respond after the Christmas holidays.

The consultation documents could be downloaded from the Scottish Canals website, printouts sent to interested parties on request, or a web version of the draft strategy viewed. Respondents were encouraged to use an online response form which set out 10 consultation questions. Additional questions were available relating to each of the 20 objectives of the 5-year plan. These were included at the foot of each objective webpage or could be downloaded as a group from the Your Feedback webpage. Alternatively, comments could be added to the foot of any webpage using the DISQUS function, emailed to heritage@scottishcanals.co.uk or sent by post to Scottish Canals’ head office.

Heritage Strategy customer e-newsletters were circulated to 586 contacts on 30 November and 14 January. The distribution list was put together from circulation and respondent lists compiled from the Scottish Canals 2012 Waterspace Strategy and Listening to our Stakeholders consultations in addition to heritage sector contacts. The consultation was advertised on Scottish Canals and the Scottish Waterways Trust websites, Facebook and on Twitter, in The Scotsman newspaper on 30 November and in Towpath Talk on 5 December (online) and 13 December (in print).

Verbal feedback formed part of the consultation with the heritage strategy presented as part of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) lunchtime lecture series on 9 January and as a Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies (Edinburgh University) Conservation Masterclass on 17 January. Principles were also discussed at the Culture Matters conference on 15 November in Norwich. The views of specialist audiences were elicited.
outwith the consultation period at a Historic Scotland lunchtime seminar on 28 September and at
the Scottish Transport & Industry Collections & Knowledge Network (STICK) spring meeting on 16
March.

The SEA process involved a number of stages prior to the publication of the Environmental Report
which required formal consultation with Historic Scotland, Scottish Natural Heritage and the
Scottish Environment Protection Agency. For further details please refer to the Environmental
Report and forthcoming Post-Adoption Statement which will be available at
www.scottishcanals.co.uk/heritage-strategy/background.
2. Findings

2.1 Summary of Responses

Participants were encouraged to use an online response form and structure their written responses using a series of 10 questions which were included in both the web-based and .pdf versions of the draft strategy. Question 7 and two of the 38 responses specifically relate to the Environmental Report. These will be summarised in the forthcoming Post-Adoption Statement.

Of the remaining 36 respondents 12 used the online form and four others also used the questions to structure their responses. The remaining responses related to the main sections of the draft strategy or provided general comments and therefore the sections and corresponding questions are used to structure the summary of responses below. For ease of reference, links to the corresponding webpages for each section are also provided.

2.2.1 Introduction

The introduction set out our reasons for producing a draft strategy, its scope in terms of the heritage it covered and summarised its format.

One respondent requested that the Scottish Waterways Trust be more prominent in early sections of the strategy given their role as a strategic partner.

One respondent felt that the scope of the strategy could be clearer in terms of covering both our cultural and natural heritage.

2.2.2 Core Purpose

The 2038 Vision of the strategy was made up of four parts: 1) Core Purpose; 2) Guiding Principles; 3) Vision Statement; and 4) Strategic Aims. Core Purpose briefly explained the legislative and policy framework for Scottish Canals remit to care for canal heritage.

Three respondents felt that the status of the strategy could be better explained in this section by referencing to overarching Scottish Canals strategic documents and making it clearer whether the Core Purpose applied only to the heritage strategy or to Scottish Canals as a whole. One respondent suggested that Scottish Government’s mission statement for Scotland’s canals was made more explicit.

Eight respondents provided a single, similar request relating to the Core Purpose, that Scottish Canals primary objective for the canals to be retained as working, navigable waterways was clearly stated.

One respondent suggested referring to the care of historic assets in the Core Purpose first as a fundamental requirement to be able to achieve the other Scottish Government aims.

2.2.3 Guiding Principles

In order to help embed a vision for Scottish Canals’ heritage, the draft strategy set out a series of four guiding principles to apply to all future activities. The principles were 1) Respect: We show respect towards people and non-renewable resources, and are accountable for our actions; 2) Excel: We strive to achieve high quality in all aspects of our work through due diligence, creativity and innovation; 3) Co-operate: We work constructively with others, seeking common goals and lasting benefits and 4) Engage: We listen to others, empower people, and celebrate our collective achievements.
Six respondents agreed with the Guiding Principles describing them as clear, robust and forming a good basis to help achieve the vision.

Two respondents felt that the principles were too generic and intangible to be practical.

One respondent felt that it could be made clearer that the principles apply to Scottish Canals as a whole. One respondent suggested that the principles should be given less prominence in the finalised strategy to help make the strategy more engaging and less corporate.

One respondent suggested that the first principle, Respect, could be extended to all resources.

One respondent suggested adding an additional principle: “Conserve and Restore: We will conserve and restore the historic and natural environment in and around the canal” as the foundation for the long-term delivery of the other four principles.

2.2.4 Vision Statement

The Vision Statement in the draft strategy is: Through our good stewardship the heritage of our canals will be valued, celebrated and conserved for Scotland.

To explain further the draft stated that we could bring about real benefits for people’s lives and would aim to ensure that our heritage will be well understood and managed and that people will feel that they have a stake in securing its future.

Nine respondents agreed with the Vision Statement, one in particular described it as “concise and outward facing”. Three respondents went on to add further comments: 1) that it should be more explicit that it is for the benefit of people and 2) that the canal’s development potential should be referred to.

One respondent thought that the vision could be more engaging and should relate to the heritage of the canals, not only to the heritage in the care of Scottish Canals.

To avoid ambiguity one respondent suggested rewording ‘heritage’ to ‘heritage and environment’. One respondent suggested changing the statement slightly so that the importance of heritage is integrated into the work and priorities of other functions.

One respondent thought that the vision was too general to be able to evaluate whether progress had been made towards it.

Two respondents said that it would be preferable if Scottish Canals’ new vision were available first or for the strategy to be issued as part of a wider policy brief. They felt that it needed to be clear how the heritage strategy vision statement related to the organisation’s vision and to avoid possible issues if the heritage strategy vision did not align.

2.2.5 Strategic Aims

Four long-term aims were proposed in order to achieve the Vision Statement: 1) Conservation & Maintenance – Our heritage assets reach or exceed a ‘steady-state’, limiting deterioration and maintaining their significance; 2) Participation & Learning – People are empowered with knowledge and skills to deliver positive heritage outcomes; 3) Access & Interpretation – Our heritage is well known, accessible, promoted and appreciated; 4) Sustainability – Our approach to heritage assures environmental and organisational sustainability and derives social and economic benefits.
Four respondents explicitly agreed with the Strategic Aims. One respondent said that Conservation & Maintenance should be the highest priority, one agreed with the order provided in the draft, and one respondent felt that they were equally important.

Five respondents provided comments relating to Conservation & Maintenance. Two specific themes were identified. Firstly that it was not clear if this aim covered natural heritage as well as built heritage as the aim should be to enhance and expand the biodiversity value of the canal corridor rather that limiting deterioration and maintaining their significance. Secondly, that the aim should be more ambitious and the resource improved over the next 25 years and so the term ‘steady state’ should be defined or replaced with a more appropriate phrase.

Three respondents provided comments on the Participation & Learning aim. Reworking the aim to include “people can engage positively with canal heritage” or “people and communities are actively involved in conserving, enhancing and promoting canal heritage” was suggested. One respondent thought that the Participation & Learning aim could subsume the Access & Interpretation aim.

Two respondents commented on the Access & Interpretation aim. One suggested that it focus on promotion and advocacy and one suggested that it be reworded to incorporate “to engage with a wider audience”.

One respondent through that the idea of expanding canal heritage should be considered, i.e. safeguarding the heritage of the future, under the Sustainability aim.

Two respondents suggested an additional aim related to development. One respondent suggested “Regeneration – new development either by Scottish Canals, in partnership or by third parties will enhance the existing conservation asset and encourage revitalised use of the canal and its infrastructure where appropriate”. The other respondent thought that Scottish Canals should look for development opportunities and support ambition and innovation.

### 2.2.6 Issues and Opportunities

The 2013–18 Plan of the draft strategy was made up of three parts: 1) Issues and Opportunities; 2) Objectives; and 3) Evaluation.

**Key issues** identified over the next 5 years were 1) Condition of heritage assets; 2) Baseline knowledge; and 3) General awareness of canal heritage. **Opportunities** were listed under the themes of 1) Brand development; 2) Stakeholder participation; 3) Partnership; and 4) Skills and enterprise.

Two respondents specifically agreed with the issues and opportunities; one was pleased to see archives included in the Baseline knowledge issue and the other the recognition of the potential of volunteers under the Stakeholder participation opportunity. One respondent made a general comment and requested greater detail on how the issues and opportunities had been identified.

In relation to the Condition of heritage assets and General awareness of canal heritage issues, one respondent thought that in order to develop a clear and relevant future strategy, the document should include analysis of the current canal-related estate to identify and prioritise buildings and structures at risk.
Six respondents provided comments on the Baseline knowledge issue. Two respondents suggested that natural heritage issues needed to be better defined and two suggested that canal enthusiasts and the wider community be engaged to inform the baseline which is linked to the General awareness of canal heritage issue. One respondent requested a definition of intangible assets.

Three respondents commented on the Brand development opportunity. One sought clarification as to whether “clearly defined values that will shape our work” already exist or have yet to be defined. The other two respondents welcomed the opportunity as constructive and suggested other opportunities this could tap into such as the Year of Homecoming 2014.

Two respondents made suggestions in relation to the Stakeholder participation opportunity. These were to consider involving community service projects, utilising the local development plan process to increase community involvement and volunteering, and ensuring volunteer management and support is properly resourced.

One respondent commended the partnership with Glasgow City Council to develop the strategy and that we should aim to replicate this with other authorities together with the model of building capacity in the heritage sector to deliver strategic outcomes.

Three respondents suggested additional issues or opportunities, these were: 1) safety and access should be primary considerations; 2) the canal landscape should be enhanced where it forms part of the setting of other cultural assets; and 3) the availability of funding and resources should be addressed.

2.2.7 Objectives

The main body of the plan consisted of twenty objectives designed to address the issues and harness opportunities and contribute to delivering the strategic aims. Each objective was given a high, medium or low priority, accompanied by a series of actions with target dates, delivery mechanisms and measures. Key actions, target dates and a summary of the delivery mechanisms were set out in the .pdf version of the strategy. Greater detail and search options were provided in the web version.

Question 5

Do you have specific comments on one or more Objective? Do you have any views on how the Objectives relate to the Issues and Opportunities and Strategic Aims? Do you agree with how they have been prioritised?

General comments

Two respondents agreed with thrust of the objectives in the draft strategy, one of these respondents felt that they could have been less aspirational however.

One respondent agreed with how the objectives have been prioritised.

One respondent suggested that actions that contribute to more than one objective should be repeated under all applicable objectives.

One respondent felt that more precise actions should be included such as to reuse canal stables and increase mooring provision to enable more boaters to bring life to the canals.

One respondent suggested that Objectives 7, 9 and 14–16 could be grouped together.

One respondent suggested a range of current projects that should be mentioned in the plan.

One respondent felt that the 5-year plan should include indications of costs and sources of potential funding and Scottish Canals investment so that the strategy is more robust.

Specific comments

The following comments relate to specific objectives and are arranged numerically. They are made by single respondents unless otherwise stated:
Objective 1: Baseline
- Expand Action 1.1: Identify historic assets, audit significance and condition and define maintenance needs to include “set out a programme for when this should happen and how it may be funded”.
- Add actions relating to gathering baselines for natural heritage, intangible heritage and health values.
- Idea of reviewing the canal estate and prioritisation in Objective 2: Prioritised Maintenance is supported but more emphasis should be given to the Monkland Canal.

Objective 3: Vacant properties
- Supports reuse of vacant properties as a means of improving the scenic value of the canals which will benefit water-based activities and businesses.
- Include action to reuse Craigmarloch Stables, Forth & Clyde Canal.
- Lower the priority given to this objective which is currently High.

Objective 4: Artefacts and archive
- Background on British Waterways archives offered.
- Agrees that the archives objective will help to meet the Conservation & Maintenance and Access & Interpretation aims but it also contributes to Participation & Learning and Sustainability.

Objective 5: Biodiversity
- Utilise and digitise Scottish Wildlife Trust Phase I habitat surveys from the 1990s to minimise extent of resurvey.
- Consult canal users to inform Scottish Canals about plantlife in and along the canals.
- Add action to assess the impact of vegetation and habitat management on protected species.
- Add action to create long-term land management strategy from vegetation survey data.
- Integrate the actions currently listed under this objective with other objectives.
- Increase priority given to this objective which is currently Medium.
- Bring forward target date of Action 5.4: Develop project to consolidate Shirva Stables (Forth & Clyde) and create wildlife habitat.

Objective 6: Graffiti
- Provide a more specific action, for example “We will inspect the route X times and make sure graffiti is dealt with”.
- Supports the objective and the opportunity to change behaviour and engage young people using innovative methods.

Objective 7: Communications
- Develop interactive relationships, create a programme of heritage-related content and create cruising apps using volunteers.
- Link to tourism websites, provide guided walks and emphasize links to historic or local events.

Objective 9: Access and Interpretation
- Include role of arts and events in this objective and add an action to develop a canal interpretation plan.
- Consider adding an action specifically related to encouraging access along towpaths to deliver recreational access for all.

Objective 10: Landscape
- Consider reviewing landscape character assessments.
- Consider merging with Objective 20: Townscape or integrating the actions currently listed under this objective with other objectives.
• Establish the impact of the canal on landscape, communities and culture today and in the past.

**Objective 12: Traditional Skills**

• Link this objective and Objective 3: Prioritised Maintenance.
• Include action to audit existing skills, knowledge and experience to establish local groups that can assist with projects.
• Increase priority given to this objective which is currently Medium.

**Objective 15: Oral history**

• Actions appear to have an urban and west coast focus, therefore greater balance is required.
• Prioritise facilitating and publishing canal-related family histories.

**Objective 17: Policies and Processes**

• Consider setting up a Section 17 Management Agreement with Historic Scotland.
• Consider an action to create a Conservation Estates Management Plan for the canal in Glasgow with Historic Scotland and Glasgow City Council.
• Consider whether Conservation Area status in Glasgow would help meet the strategy’s objectives.

**Objective 20: Townscape**

• Consider contribution of canals in urban areas and the potential for regeneration.
• Consider merging with Objective 10: Landscape.

2.2.8 Evaluation

The evaluation explained how the actions would be monitored, that the final strategy would be a live document, maintained online and that we would report progress on a regular basis.

**Question 6**

Do you have any views on how any of the Objectives will be monitored? Do you have any comments about how progress will be reported? Do you have any suggestions about how we should keep you informed?

One respondent suggested that an implementation group should be set up to monitor progress and another respondent felt that capacity is needed to involve a wider group of existing and potential canal users to represent all those accountable for delivering the strategy outcomes.

Two respondents suggested an annual reporting cycle and one suggested quarterly updates. Five respondents suggested electronic methods of keeping stakeholders informed would be suitable, including e-newsletters, a central information point on the Scottish Canals website and the use of social networking.

One respondent recommended consulting with other groups such as funding bodies and existing partnerships to learn from the methods they have used to monitor and report progress successfully.

One respondent felt that the draft strategy did not include tangible, measurable targets and so thought progress could not be reported objectively.
2.2.9 General comments

Question 8
Do you have any other comments on any aspect of the draft strategy or on the consultation process?

Ten respondents welcomed the strategy, describing it as “a credible way forward” and “full of good ideas and fine objectives” and that it had followed a “logical path”.

Two respondents made a general point that the strategy appeared skewed as it covered cultural heritage more fully than natural heritage and needed to be more holistic. One respondent emphasized the contribution of canals to regeneration which needs to be a key feature of a wider strategy to ensure success. One respondent suggested that we prioritise training and motivate our own staff to deliver positive visitor experiences.

Two respondents wished to feature more prominently in the strategy as a key stakeholder or delivery partner. One respondent suggested that we make more links with other related websites. One suggested renaming the document to “strategy and plan” whilst another suggested renaming the 5-year plan “priorities” for clarity. One respondent suggested that we provide a single point of contact for the public to express their views.

With regard to the consultation process, one respondent found it to be too complex with multiple documents and web-based resources and two respondents found the text difficult to follow because of the use of jargon and complex language. One respondent thought that the consultation could have been publicised more widely. One respondent would have appreciated more time to put their response together and local consultation workshops would have been welcomed. One respondent appreciated the opportunity to comment on the draft and felt that canal users should be consulted more often about strategies.

2.2.10 Strategy format

Question 9
Did you use the web-based version of the draft or the .pdf version or a combination of both? Did you find it or them easy to use?

Six respondents used a combination of the web-based and .pdf versions of the strategy, two used the .pdf only and two the web version only.

Three respondents liked the way the strategy was laid out and the option of consulting both versions and made use of their different functions. One respondent said that it was easier to get a sense of the whole strategy using the .pdf version.

Three respondents found the web-based version difficult to navigate through. One of these respondents recommended document-only consultations in the future and had found the .pdf difficult to locate. One respondent had been unable to access the .pdf version.

Two respondents had specific issues with the online response form as it could not be saved in stages before submission. One of the respondents had lost their first attempt at completing it.

2.2.11 Participation

Question 10
Do you have any suggestions about how we can encourage people to help us develop and implement the heritage strategy?

Three respondents suggested stakeholder events or workshops to incorporate the wider public’s ideas into the strategy. One respondent felt that boat users should be well-
represented on an implementation committee. Another respondent would include all canal users as well as others such as local history societies.

Four respondents suggested encouraging more press and media coverage to report heritage “good news” and promote involvement.

One respondent suggested putting together a key stakeholder list and establishing an implementation group. One respondent suggested an engagement plan. Another respondent recommended putting together a work plan which takes account of the commitments of all partners so that the actions can be delivered.
2.2 Main Issues and Our Conclusions

Five main issues have been identified from the consultation responses received. These are listed below together with how we will take them into account in the final strategy. We will review all the other minor points raised. Factual issues and points of information will be taken on board. The summary of responses will inform the implementation of the 5-year plan and its annual review.

2.2.1 Issue 1: The Vision

Whilst most respondents were supportive of the Vision Statement, several felt that it was important to clarify how the heritage strategy vision fits Scottish Canals overarching vision and that Scottish Government’s mission for Scotland’s canals should be clearly stated in the strategy. Two respondents felt that the vision for canal heritage should not pre-empt Scottish Government’s new policy for Scotland’s canals and Scottish Canals’ new vision.

Conclusion

As the Scottish Government’s new policy for Scotland’s canals and Scottish Canals’ new vision was due to be published shortly after the original publication date of the final strategy, Scottish Canals decided to delay finalising the strategy until these documents were available. In this way it will help to demonstrate how the strategy relates to government and corporate policies and ensure that the heritage strategy vision underpins the future direction of the organisation.

Scottish Government’s Making the most of Scotland’s canals and Scottish Canals’ new vision ‘Safeguarding our Heritage. Building our Future.’ were published on 24 April 2013. The final heritage strategy will be published on 6 May 2013.

2.2.2 Issue 2: Natural Heritage

The draft strategy explained that natural heritage is included in the scope of the heritage strategy in the introduction and issues and opportunities section. However several respondents felt that the strategy placed more emphasis on cultural heritage. In particular, they felt that the Conservation & Maintenance strategic aim should be revised to include enhancement of the natural heritage resource, that objectives related to natural heritage should be a higher priority and suggested additional actions to manage the resource.

Conclusion

In response to this issue, the introduction will be revised to clarify the role of the strategy to deliver natural heritage benefits, the background to the strategy development will be explained further and an additional early action will be included in the 5-year plan to re-evaluate objectives and actions relating to natural heritage.

The Conservation & Maintenance strategic aim will be revised to take the comments on board. This will also help to address comments that the aim should be more ambitious for heritage in general.

2.2.3 Issue 3: Scope

Some respondents felt that the strategy should include aims and objectives relating to regeneration and development, maintenance of the waterways for navigation and physical access for recreation and health.

Conclusion

The Introduction section in the final strategy will be expanded so that it is more explicit about the scope of the heritage strategy in terms of the heritage covered, the aims of the strategy and aims that relate to the overarching corporate vision and other corporate strategies.

The scope of the heritage strategy will not be expanded to include development and regeneration, navigation and access in general.

A complementary heritage policy for Scottish Canals is being development and will be available from the policy section of the Scottish Canals corporate website http://www.scottishcanals.co.uk corporative-home/policy. This will address those points that relate...
to heritage management and the principles in the Scottish Government’s policy that are outwith the scope of the heritage strategy.

2.2.4 Issue 4: Implementation

Respondents offered suggestions for how the plan would be implemented most effectively. An implementation group should be established and a work plan be created which includes more detail about the actions including costings. Communities and interest groups should be engaged more widely in consultation and to assist implementation.

Conclusion

Scottish Canals will take on board the ideas raised about how people may be encouraged to help us develop and implement the strategy in the preparation of Action 7.1 Develop heritage communications strategy.

As part of our partnership with Glasgow City Council we will be producing a more detailed extract of the strategy for this area. An implementation group and an area-based or annual or corporate plan-period work plan and are ideas which we will take forward.

2.2.5 Issue 5: Format

There were mixed responses about the dual web-based and .pdf formats of the draft heritage strategy in terms of how user-friendly they were. Some respondents thought that they were exemplary whilst others found the web-based version complex and confusing.

Conclusion

Through the consultation process, Scottish Canals sought feedback on the functionality of the web-version of the strategy in particular as a new way to present strategies of this type. We have taken all the feedback on board in putting the final strategy format together. The .pdf version of the strategy will be easier to locate, navigation through the web-based version of the strategy will be simpler and a .pdf version of the detailed 5-year plan will also be available. On balance we have decided to retain a dual format as this will meet the needs of a cross-section of users and a web-version allows progress against actions to be regularly updated.

We have noted the issues about the functionality of the online response form for any future consultations.
3. Next Steps

3.1 Finalising the Plan

The draft strategy will be revised to take account of the main issues that have been raised during the public consultation.

The final heritage strategy will be available from www.scottishcanals.co.uk/heritage-strategy on 6 May 2013.

In order to fulfil the statutory requirements of section 18 of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, a post-adoption statement will be available to download from: www.scottishcanals.co.uk/heritage-strategy/background after the final strategy is published. It will explain how the findings of the environmental assessment informed the final strategy, how the opinions expressed on the assessment were taken into account, and what measures are proposed to monitor the environmental effects of the strategy.
## Annex A: List of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Arthur Keller, Operations Manager, <a href="mailto:arthur.keller@snh.gov.uk">arthur.keller@snh.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Waterways Trust</td>
<td>Tracey Peedle, Director of Development, New Port Downie, Lime Road, Tannourhill, Falkirk, FK1 4RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
<td>Andrew Stevenson, Senior Heritage Management Officer (SEA) &amp; Valerie Lusk, Policy Directorate, Longmore House, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environment Protection Agency</td>
<td>Lorna Maclean, Principal Policy Officer (SEA), <a href="mailto:sea.gateway@sepa.org.uk">sea.gateway@sepa.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randak Design</td>
<td>Charles Randak, 90 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, G1 3NQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland</td>
<td>Robin Turner, Head of Survey, John Sinclair House, 16 Bernard Terrace, Edinburgh, EH8 9NX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td>Jonathan Willet, The Highland Council, Planning &amp; Development, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5NX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>Richard Todd, Policy Planner, Broombhill Industrial Estate, Kilsyth Road, Kirkintilloch, G66 1TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Waterways Association (North Lancs and Cumbria Branch)</td>
<td>John Burt, Scottish Representative, <a href="mailto:johnburt147@hotmail.co.uk">johnburt147@hotmail.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Industrial Archaeology</td>
<td>Mark Sissons, Chairman, 33 Burgate, Pickering, North Yorkshire, YO18 7AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Yachting Association Scotland</td>
<td>Gordon Daly, Convener, Caledonia House, 1 Redheughs Rigg, South Gyle, Edinburgh, EH12 9DQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagull Trust Cruises Boats Committee</td>
<td>Gordon Daly, Convener, The Boathouse and Reception Centre, Bantaskine Estate, Falkirk FK1 5PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ballast Trust</td>
<td>Kiara King, 18-20 Waterinshaw Street, Johnstone, PA5 8AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>Liz Davidson, Principal City Design, Development and Regeneration Services, 231 George Street, Glasgow, G1 1RX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Kelvin Valley Park</td>
<td>Paul Carter, Chair, Woodlenn, High Banton, Kilsyth, G65 0RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilsyth and Villages Community Forum</td>
<td>Paul Carter, Chair, Woodlenn, High Banton, Kilsyth, G65 0RA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wjhall@talktalk.net">wjhall@talktalk.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Sillitoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Urquhart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Duncan</td>
<td>36 Bankrow, Wick, Caithness, KW15EY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Griffiths</td>
<td>Building Learning, Riddle’s Court, 322 Lawnmarket, Edinburgh, EH1 2PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Gordon Daly</td>
<td>80 Beaumont Drive, Carron, Falkirk, FK2 8SN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia McLoay</td>
<td>18 Culmore Place, Hallglen, Falkirk, FK1 2RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Grannon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Payne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hodkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Hilder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals A – G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>