

**RESPONSE TO THE
SNOWDONIA GREEN KEY
STRATEGY AND WORKING PLAN
2005/2006**

**Draft
August 2005**

Prepared on behalf of the members of
Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia

Submitted to the Project Officer
on 13th December, 2005

LIST OF CONTENTS

<u>1: FREEDOM TO CHOOSE– SNOWDONIA</u>	1
<u>1.1 The Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia group: Why we exist.</u>	1
<u>1.2 Recognition of our contribution to the consultation process</u>	1
<u>2: STRATEGY AND WORKING PLAN 2005/2006</u>	2
<u>2.1 General overview</u>	2
<u>2.2 Summary of the issues and proposals which cause us concern</u>	4
<u>3. SPECIFIC COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS</u>	5
<u>4: CONCLUSION</u>	6
<u>APPENDIX:</u>	7
<u>A.1 Lack of information about the Snowdonia Green Key draft</u> <u>report 2005/2006</u>	7
<u>A.2 Lack of information in the draft report</u>	8
<u>A.3 Misleading Documents</u>	9

1: Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia

1.1 The Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia group: Why we exist.

1.1.1..Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia was formed on 8th January 2002 in response to the *Snowdonia Green Key Strategy Statement - Consultation Draft*¹, hereafter referred to as the *First Consultation Draft*.

1.1.2. The group is comprised of both local residents and people from outside Snowdonia representing a wide range of interests who are bound together by a deep concern for the future of Snowdonia and the quality of experience which it can provide. We support the principles of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 which fosters “*air and exercise and the study of nature*” and the obligation “*to facilitate access to these experiences*”.

1.1.3. The group was set up to facilitate responses to the *First Consultation Draft* so that the many and varied users of the National Park, many of whom are visitors upon which much of the economy of the area depends, would be able to voice their opinions and suggestions. In our view it is important that the wider community of users of the National Park who are not necessarily members of any official bodies that might represent them, should have a means to make their opinions and suggestions known and taken into consideration.

1.1.4. From the outset in 2002 the group sought to:

- Provide information about the Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and the consultation process.
- Urge people to respond, either for or against, the strategy within the consultation period.
- Provide a means to co-ordinate responses against certain aspects of the strategy.
- Make available the observations made by people who rejected the strategy.
- Provide a bilingual approach, where practicable, to the information provided by the group. (it quickly became evident that the Group did not have the resources to sustain this approach).

1.1.5. The group may be contacted by:

- website: www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk
- Post: c/o Ffrancon House, Tyn y Maes, Nant Ffrancon, Bethesda, Gwynedd LL57 3LX
- Tel: 01248 600 874;
- Fax: 0870 1319690;
- Email: freedom.to.choose@btinternet.com

1.2 Recognition of our contribution to the consultation process

1.2.1. We feel that the approach we took with respect to the *First Consultation Draft* has been vindicated, it brought forward many constructive comments as well as voicing negative proposals principally concerned with the compulsory aspects of the Park and Ride scheme which have now been abandoned. A number of the suggestions made in our response² have been incorporated into the *Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006*³ and this contribution to the initiative

¹ Snowdonia Green Key Strategy Statement - Consultation Draft - August 2001; Planning & Economic Development Department, Gwynedd Council
(<http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/SGK.strategy.final.1101.gmpo.pdf>)

² Response to the Snowdonia Green Key Strategy Statement – Consultation Draft, August 2001; Freedom to Choose – Snowdonia, 2002. (http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/ftc_2002_response.PDF)

³ Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006 (Draft August 2005)
(http://www.gwynedd.gov.uk/upload/public/attachments/813/SNOWDONIA_GREEN_KEY_INITIATIVE.pdf)

was acknowledged in a letter sent by the Snowdonia Green Key Partnership to Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia which said:

"We perceive Freedom to Choose - Snowdonia as a key stakeholder group because it represents the views of so many individuals and organisations that visit and/or use Northern Snowdonia. The comments and feedback received via the group during and after the consultation period have been invaluable. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Freedom to Choose for the written response made in relation to the draft strategy statement and to fully acknowledge the amount of work this represented.

A number of very worthwhile and positive ideas have come forward as a result of the consultation which I believe can be developed further if we work closely together. Accordingly I will be in contact soon to arrange the first of what I hope will be a series of regular meetings with the group."

1.2.2. The *Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006* also recognizes the benefit of wide consultation and notes in paragraph 4.3 that:

"The amount of feedback received from the original strategy and from the public meetings was substantial with a significant and valuable amount of information also collected by the opposition group 'Freedom to Choose'".

Comment: We are not an 'opposition' group. We support sensible constructive developments; any objections we make are concerned with proposals that we think are destructive to the principles underlying the ethos of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949.

1.2.3. In preparing this response Freedom to Choose – Snowdonia has drawn upon the information made available to it in previous reports; comments made to it by members of the group and others, together with information about the market research survey conducted by students in the summer of 2004 which was made available to the group on CD-ROM by the Snowdonia Green Key Initiative.

2: Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006

The whole of this response is based on the Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006 (Draft August 2005) NOT the Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006 Executive Summary⁴, which provides differing information.

2.1 General overview

2.1.1. The *Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006 (Draft August 2005)* continues to outline desirable intentions, e.g.:

- improved public transport.
- improved safety for parking.
- enhanced visitor experience and consequent benefits to local economy.

We support all of these, provided they are proven realistic. The document as a whole, however, does not engender confidence. (see our Appendix).

2.1.2. The strategy of listing by objectives is misleading, as this does not itself constitute proof of their practicality within the terms of the scheme.

⁴ Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006: Executive Summary
(http://www.gwynedd.gov.uk/upload/public/attachments/813/exec_summ_whole_doc.pdf)

2.1.3. Use of the Transport Grant obliges a concentration on a bus system, which in practice, and by the evidence of the students' report, contradicts its purpose. An increased bus service with attendant facilities, even with increased usage, would raise the subsidy liability. The Transport Grant therefore would appear to be driving a policy of debt without a reasoned likelihood of a 'modal shift' from the car to the bus.

2.1.4. Parking policy is not clear and appears restrictive. Reference is made to extension of facilities, restructuring existing facilities and using stopping up orders to close off redundant sections of highway but "*to retain the existing status quo*" [Para 4.4].

The 'status quo' concept, introduced in the RPS report⁵ has no place in commonsense. Each location has to be considered on merit and there is a strong case for additional parking facilities in lesser used areas, especially where many miles of road hasten visitors past features which quite reasonably should be seen and accessed. Such provision could reduce concentration on 'honey pot' areas. Furthermore, it seems to have been seriously overlooked that restrictive policies diminish the efficient rôle of the car as an enabler to an active day and would increase its lazy touring rôle, exacerbating not diminishing the environmental problem.

2.1.5. Parking charges raise some serious issues. Only one bus service appears to be well used⁶ (S1) because of the popularity of Snowdon and lack of parking space. If additional services are continued at a loss, the subsidy from parking charges may not be adequate. The claim that charging may also finance other desirable recreational and environmental assets is questionable. It would require absolute profit and certainty.

Details relating to costs must be transparent; voting on a questionnaire does not constitute a licence to proceed. The survey students also perceptively stated that July and August figures constituted an unrealistic study⁷. The annual figures would condemn the logic of the scheme.

Most importantly, the commandeering of access via a developed, managed, charged and controlled parking system is highly questionable.

The students in the final sentence of their report⁸ saw fit to emphasise that this point had been clearly identified by many of those questioned. They said:

"It should be taken into consideration that many participants said that the main reason that they visit Snowdonia is because of the rural and undeveloped nature of the countryside. If the area becomes too commercialised and overdeveloped, then it could drive away many of the regular visitors".

National Parks are valued, not only for their integral beauty but also the access principle contained in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949.

⁵ p42:- Snowdonia Green Key Initiative: Re-Appraisal Report, Stage 1; RPS Planning, Transportation and Environment, 2002.

(<http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/RPS.SGK.report.final.0502.pdf>)

⁶ Green Key Bus Counts spreadsheet – supplied on CD Rom to Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia by the Snowdonia Green Key Project Manager. ([http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/Green Key Bus Counts.pdf](http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/Green%20Key%20Bus%20Counts.pdf))

⁷ Section headed 'Evaluation' in a report by students who carried out a survey by questionnaire during the summer of 2004 – supplied on CD Rom to Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia by the Snowdonia Green Key Project Manager. ([http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/Student Report.pdf](http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/Student%20Report.pdf))

⁸ *Ibid.*

2.2 Summary of the issues and proposals which cause us concern

2.2.1. The Strategy seems to encompass an excessively wide remit, for example, where is the mandate and expertise to “*Develop and Manage Tourism and Leisure activities*” [Para 1.1]. This might be more accurately described in the Aims and Objectives of the Initiative as ““*Develop and Manage an infrastructure to support local community*,”[†] *Tourism and Leisure activities within Northern Snowdonia*”. † our amendment.

2.2.2. The document is described as a draft for 2005/2006. It is now the end of 2005, by the time that the final document is published there will be very little time before the period expires. The strategy should refer to the period 2006/2008 or, as mentioned in the Executive Summary, to 2009.

2.2.3. “*Effective consultation is the key to the future success of the initiative*” [Para 5.3]. We fully support this statement but there is no evidence that this has happened yet. Appendix C appears to be merely a list of persons interviewed; if it is a list of consultees the minutes or notes should be available.

2.2.4. There appears to be an obsessive concentration on parking at Ogwen and Pen-y-Gwryd. The proposals for Ogwen would have the effect of reducing the total parking available by some 50% with no indication of alternatives as has happened, for example, during the recent work to “*create a formal car park*” at the Bochlwyd layby. The very fact that there is frequent illegal parking near Ogwen Cottage would indicate a need for increase rather than decrease in provision. The proposed works at Ogwen do not appear to be of any benefit and could be seen as over-development.

Loss of parking spaces at Ogwen is seen as a direct threat to businesses in Capel Curig and also, although to a lesser extent Betws y Coed, Bethesda and the Pen-y-Gwryd Hotel.

Every vehicle parked at Ogwen represents potential custom - all year round - not just in the summer season, as stated in the Strategy.

It would seem sensible not to interfere with that which is working well and is of benefit to the economy. Funding could be better used elsewhere of which Bryn Glo car park is a good example.

2.2.5. A convincing argument has not been made for parking charges, particularly in relation to local businesses and in which areas they might apply. No costings have been provided or explanation of how any ‘*surplus*’ would be applied to other facilities.

2.2.6. The urbanisation implicit in some of the proposals is of some concern such as inappropriate ‘*landscaping*’, bus stops, ‘*Real Time*’ information and car parking signage. Details of these aspects are an important element of consultation.

2.2.7. The notion that visitors do not spend enough still seems to underlie the report although this is debunked by the Student 2004 questionnaire⁹ and the Northern Snowdonia Study¹⁰. Expenditure in Snowdonia is approximately average in comparison with other National Parks.

⁹ Green Key Questionnaires spreadsheet – supplied on CD Rom to Freedom to Choose– Snowdonia by the Snowdonia Green Key Project Manager.

(<http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/Green%20Key%20Questionnaires%20revised%20layout.pdf>)

¹⁰ p15, para 2.21 and fig 2.6:- Bishop, K *et al.* (1998), Northern Snowdonia Study: Developing Local Economic Opportunities through the Management of Visitor Traffic; Environmental Planning Research Unit, Cardiff University. ISBN 1897901747.

3. Specific Comments/Suggestions

If the Snowdonia Green Key Initiative is to be successful we believe that the following would be of help:

3.1. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW),

The CROW Act and access to the countryside is featured in the strategy. This presents an opportunity to develop some of the outlying or lesser used areas of the Park. There is a strong case therefore to investigate this aspect and make provision with additional stopping and parking facilities.

3.2. Buses

The service to Pen-y-Pass appears to be the most successful. We believe that Pen-y-Gwryd is a better turning point than Pen-y-Pass. This would enable a shuttle service for Nant Peris (Llanberis) to Pen-y-Gwryd and back, calling at Pen-y-Pass en route.

A turning point already exists at Pen-y-Gwryd and space could be released at Pen-y-Pass. Pen-y-Gwryd is also a natural meeting point and services for Beddgelert and Capel Curig (or Betws y Coed) to Pen-y-Gwryd could be coordinated with the Pen-y-Pass shuttle. It is important to ensure that buses are reliable and that drivers are courteous, helpful and welcoming.¹¹

We would support experimentation with alternative fuels to decrease damaging emissions.

3.3. Pen-y-Gwryd parking

We would support the establishment of discreet parking areas at Pen-y-Gwryd and believe this should be investigated. We also support the retention of verge parking albeit with some limitations. Any surfacing work carried out in relation to this area should use indigenous materials or wheelchair friendly grass crete.

3.4. Sections of redundant highway traditionally used as laybys and stopping places.

We recommend retention and basic maintenance of these as they fulfill several valuable functions: eg. viewpoints, safety havens, rest areas, and access to footpaths and other features. They are frequently enjoyed by those who have no wish, or who are unable, to venture very far from their vehicles. Their usage also has a scattering effect and does not concentrate vehicles into large groups.

3.5. Parking at peak periods

Additional provision could be created by encouraging landowners where appropriate, to open up fields for limited periods.

3.6. We are fully supportive of improvements to existing parking provision, provided it is carried out without loss of spaces and without inappropriate 'landscaping'.

3.7. We believe also that some attention should be given to establish additional parking and stopping provision for example: there are several points along the A5 and the A470 road where footpaths and other routes intersect and where links could be established with public transport. There are other roads which have long continuous sections without provision for stopping thus preventing access to existing paths. Restrictions encourage a 'drive around' culture.

3.8. The upper section of the road between Beddgelert and Pen-y-Gwryd is frequently partially blocked by buses and large vehicles. To facilitate improved movement of traffic particularly buses it would be helpful to provide sensitive easements without losing the character of the road.

3.9. On Demand Transport

This would appear to be a positive and more appropriate alternative to buses where the bus service is

¹¹ The report by students who carried out a survey by questionnaire during the summer of 2004 – supplied on CD Rom to Freedom to Choose – Snowdonia by the Snowdonia Green Key Project Manager - noted that “*Many of the bus drivers are quite unfriendly and unhelpful towards visitors*”.
(http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/Student_Report.pdf)

underused and particularly along roads inaccessible to buses. It has the advantages of being more flexible but again, as with buses, reliability and capacity has to be proven and a cost comparison would be useful. Contact information should be widely available.

3.10. We support the general principle of encouraging people off the highway on to paths.

3.11. Reference is made to “*Restricting drop offs on the highway*” [6.3.1] in order to reduce congestion. We fully support the reasoning for this, however, provision needs to be made for vehicles other than buses to drop off passengers. Vehicles thus engaged are frequently supporting local businesses such as guest houses or activity providers and will not require to occupy parking space.

3.12. The information collated from communities, user groups, businesses, visitors etc during the years of this strategy is an invaluable resource which other departments of the Council, the Welsh Assembly Government and other agencies can draw upon.

4: Conclusion

Despite much of the foregoing, as previously indicated, we fully support the statement in the introduction to the Draft Strategy that “*The Initiative seeks to promote the enjoyment of the area and its mountains by achieving an improved and flexible public transport system, improve economic returns for local businesses, and strengthen the tourist attraction of the area for a variety of user*”¹², however we have difficulties with the aims and objectives in section 1.1 and how it is proposed to achieve them.

It is now generally accepted that ‘tourism’ is a major part of the local economy which has evolved slowly over more than a century. Many aspects of this have become interdependent and we must retain flexibility in order to respond more easily to changing needs. For example, day visitors have been identified as an increasingly important part of the economy. Many shops rely on day visitors for their sustainability and are therefore able to improve facilities which in turn may attract longer term visitors.

Our rationale would be:

- Improve existing where appropriate.
- Extend provision as required.
- Minimise impact.
- Aim for best quality and added value.
- Allow for adjustment and flexibility throughout.

Our principle concern is one of sustainability. What happens when the grants/subsidies are no longer available? Access control is a ‘watershed’ change. It would outstrip other benefits. It represents an incremental degradation of the special ‘sense of place’. Even if the scheme fails, we are unlikely to see the removal of charging controls. A local population would be disinherited of its time honoured practices and the National Park treated more as the property of the tourist industry than that of those who live and work here. The argument that charging is commonplace is irrelevant in the context of National Parks ethos. Money spent on parking cannot be spent again in the local economy but, more importantly, “*forcing locals and visitors through a cash extraction process*”¹³ is a clumsy welcome. The threat of penalty is offensive and it is an established fact that happy people spend more.

To move this initiative forward it is essential to foster goodwill and gain the confidence of all those involved by a full and open dialogue.

¹² p2, Para 2:- Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006 (Draft August 2005)
(http://www.gwynedd.gov.uk/upload/public/attachments/813/SNOWDONIA_GREEN_KEY_INITIATIVE.pdf)

¹³ p4:- Snowdonia Green Key Strategy: Appraisal Document and User Survey; Snowdonia Active, 2002
([http://www.snowdonia-active.com/upload/documents/Green Key & Car Park\(5\).pdf](http://www.snowdonia-active.com/upload/documents/Green Key & Car Park(5).pdf))

Appendix:

Observations on the Document.

A.1 Lack of information about the Snowdonia Green Key draft report 2005/2006

A.1.1. “*Effective consultation is key to the future success of the Initiative*” [5.3]. Copies of the draft report are available on request but that assumes a knowledge of its existence. As with the *First Consultation Draft* the Snowdonia Green Key Initiative have not deposited copies in any of the libraries in Gwynedd, Conwy and Ynys Môn. We are not aware of any leaflets, publicity or adverts nor have any public consultation meetings been organized.

A.1.2. At a meeting with our group in July 2003 the Project Officer said that the Snowdonia Green Key Project intended to set up its own web site. It would give information about the project, what it was doing and what it had achieved. The group welcomed this as a positive step and let its own web site lapse. The web address www.snowdoniagreenkey.co.uk has been registered but it is disappointing that it has not been put into operation in time to provide information and receive comments during this new round of consultation even though it is referred to three times in the report.

“The results of both surveys will be available on the soon to be launched Snowdonia Green Key web-site (www.snowdoniagreenkey.co.uk)”. [5.2]

“Information about current projects, community and interest groups will be made available locally, and on the Snowdonia Green Key web-site”.[5.2]

“The Sherpa bus will also be promoted on the Snowdonia Green Key web site, which will be linked to public transport and the Snowdonia National Park web site”.[8.7]

To facilitate responses to the Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan from such people who would otherwise be disenfranchised, Freedom to Choose - Snowdonia re-activated its website in mid-November 2005

The six Green Key Partners all have websites but there is no information about the Snowdonia Green Key on those maintained by Snowdonia National Park Authority, Wales Tourist Board, Welsh Development Agency, Countryside Council for Wales and Conwy County Borough Council. Gwynedd Council website is the only one with a link to the Second Draft Report. There are no links to any of the earlier documents although some can be found using the site search facilities.

A.1.3. We note that the consultation is again held at a ‘quiet’ time of the year. It would have been more effective and wide ranging had the report been released at the beginning of the summer and not at the end of September when most of the visitors have gone home. The out of season period is often the time when people involved in the tourist trade are away taking their own holidays or are busy with Christmas preparations.

A.1.4. The Snowdonia Green Key press statement does give the contact details for the Project Officer but does not specifically invite responses to be made to him. Indeed he has replied to a person who sent in a direct response to him by saying that “*In order to try to manage the responses better individuals are being encouraged to respond through the official routes (i.e. local community councils or councilors and nationally through user groups such as the BMC or Ramblers).*”

This contradicts statements in the *Second Draft Report*:

*“However, the future consultation must be carefully designed to ensure that interested parties and **individuals**† are given the opportunity to comment”*[5.3]

*“The Partnership now looks forward to working with groups, communities, residents and **individuals**† to develop the area’s long term future in a sustainable and environmentally friendly way.”[5.4] †our emphasis*

A.1.5. A statement released to the press by the Snowdonia Green Key Partnership on 21/9/2005 which announced the new *Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006* did not give the date by which responses had to be made. The date is not given in the report nor is it mentioned anywhere on the Gwynedd website. The only mention seems to be in the letter sent out by Snowdonia Green Key Initiative to those on their mailing list.

The desire to ‘manage’ responses by limiting them to ‘official’ routes and the apparent oversight in publicising the date by which responses should be returned does not suggest an intention to facilitate an open and transparent consultation process that will “*ensure that interested parties and individuals are given the opportunity to comment*”. [5.3]

A.2 Lack of information in the draft report

A.2.1. The period that the report covers is not clear

The Snowdonia Green Key report is entitled *Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006* yet the press release issued by the Snowdonia Green Key Partnership on 21/9/2005 says “*The consultation process aims to involve key organisations and communities in where this Initiative goes **over the next three years**†” †our emphasis.*

In the report it states “*Phase 3 can be considered as the future of the Initiative beyond April 2006.*” [11.4] Yet in the Executive Summary Phase 3 is headed “*2006/7 and beyond*” and mentions “*funding for the next 3 years from April 2006 until March 2009. Projects have been identified for implementation over the next 3 years ..*”

A.2.2. Information about Phase 3

The information about Phase 3 in the Second Draft Report consists of two sentences. There is more information about Phase 3 in the Executive Summary¹⁴ than there is in the main report which it purports to summarise.

A.2.3. No Business Plan

“The principle behind charging for parking is to generate enough revenue to maintain a range of facilities in Northern Snowdonia. It is envisaged that additional parking revenue will be generated for this purpose and that the income currently received from parking by each individual Snowdonia Green Key Partner will remain the same” [7.5]. Detail of the current income is not given nor is there a business plan setting out the estimated costs of setting up and running the scheme or the projected income.

A.2.4. Interpretation of data

The claim is made [7.2] that “*over 95% of people questioned said they would be prepared to pay to park in order to generate sufficient revenue to maintain the facilities to an acceptable standard, to subsidise an improved Sherpa bus service and possibly towards the upkeep of the upland paths” †_ our emphasis. This is not a valid interpretation of the data as the question on the forms asks “*How much would you be prepared to pay to park per day in Snowdonia, if the money was reinvested back into facilities?*”.*

A.2.5. Decriminalised Parking

“The introduction of decriminalised parking in both Gwynedd and Conwy will enable both the Authorities to work together to enforce and manage on-street parking”[6.5]. No further information is given about the implications of this. ‘On-street’ implies it will relate to roads in a towns or villages.

¹⁴ Snowdonia Green Key Strategy and Working Plan 2005/2006: Executive Summary.
(http://www.gwynedd.gov.uk/upload/public/attachments/813/exec_summ_whole_doc.pdf)

A.2.6. Background History

The background history [4.1] is incomplete. The Initiative started in 1997 with the publication of the Institute of Welsh Affairs report *Why Snowdonia and North Wales Need a New Tourism Strategy*¹⁵. This formed the basis for the Northern Snowdonia Study published in 1998¹⁶. (The name of this report is omitted and in section 5.6 is referred to as “*the Cardiff University research*”). The Northern Snowdonia study was in turn taken forward by the Newidiem report published in 2000¹⁷. In August 2001 the *First Consultation Draft*¹⁸ was published. This was followed by the *RPS Report*¹⁹ which was published in May 2002 not March 2002 as stated [4.2]. Details of all reports should be listed in a Bibliography (there isn't one).

A.3 Misleading Documents

The *Second Consultation Draft* is riddled with contradictions which leads to confusion.

The *Second Consultation Draft* and the *Executive Summary* also contradict one another.

To give one example this comment is made in the *Executive Summary*:

"The initiative aims to improve parking rather than prohibiting parking. It does not promote construction of large new parking facilities within the core area but seeks to retain parking within dedicated, managed and landscaped car parks using redundant sections of highway located as close as possible to known pressure points." [p1]

But this approach is contradicted in a statement in the *Second Consultation Draft*:

"In order to provide a more integrated management approach, discussions are underway for one organisation to have responsibility for managing maintaining parking facilities in Northern Snowdonia. This may mean that stopping-up orders may have to be undertaken for some sections of redundant Highway". [6.5]

Also it is misleading for people to think that the *Executive Summary* is a summary of the main report when it includes items which are not in the main report and omits others which should be.

¹⁵ Osmond, John *et al.* [1997], *Why Snowdonia and North Wales need a new Tourism Strategy: A presentation to the North Wales Economic Forum, Institute of Welsh Affairs (IWA Discussion Paper No 1)*

¹⁶ Bishop, K *et al.* (1998), *Northern Snowdonia Study: Developing Local Economic Opportunities through the Management of Visitor Traffic; Environmental Planning Research Unit, Cardiff University. ISBN 1897901747.*

¹⁷ Morgan, B *et al.* (2000), *Economic Impact Analysis of the Northern Snowdonia Study – Final Report; Newidiem*

¹⁸ *Snowdonia Green Key Strategy Statement - Consultation Draft - August 2001; Planning & Economic Development Department, Gwynedd Council*

(<http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/SGK.strategy.final.1101.gmpo.pdf>)

¹⁹ *Snowdonia Green Key Initiative: Re-Appraisal Report, Stage 1; RPS Planning, Transportation and Environment, 2002.*

(<http://www.snowdonia-freedomtochoose.org.uk/PDF/RPS.SGK.report.final.0502.pdf>)