

7th January 2007

Nikki Milne
 Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department
 Marine Management Division
 Area GH93
 Victoria Quay
 Edinburgh
 EH6 6QQ

Dear Ms Milne

Here is Mull Community Council's response to the proposed Coastal and Marine National Park (CMNP).

Following the roadshow, which gave insufficient information and notice, did not take into consideration the travelling distance for people to attend location arranged. Also the stakeholder's consultation meeting held in Oban on 13th December 2006, which seemed more of a "promotional" event rather than a consultation exercise. The meeting was structured in a way that asked those present all the questions rather than being told what is proposed.

It clearly demonstrated that Community Council's in all proposed areas had not been consulted.

How can we make positive decisions for or against a CMNP when the document does not state how it would or could affect our lives and livelihood.

Positive comments for a CMNP:

How can we be positive, we do not have sufficient information to make an informed judgement.

Reasons against. How a CMNP on Mull would not improve any or all of the following:

Infra-structure:	no guarantee roads will be upgraded, which are already in a fragile state
Farming:	regulated and further legislation proposed, already on a downward spiral
Fishing:	already regulated, further inshore fishery groups being set up by Scottish Executive
Tourism:	at full capacity for seven months, other months getting busier, not controlled by legislation
Sea Tours:	already at full capacity, but unregulated
Wildlife Tours:	no Body controlling, but numbers rising
Management:	a CMNP needs to work with our local bodies
Planning:	this should remain with the local authorities, already in place
Ferries:	already at full capacity for island residents, freight and tourism, need earlier and later ferries
Medical Care/Health:	struggling to cope with an increasing aging population
Employment:	<u>would</u> there be any jobs, if so would they be sustainable
Housing:	very difficult at present due to rules and regulations already in place, price of ground sites, property prices already at an all time high and insufficient affordable housing
Indoor recreation:	no leisure facilities available
Hotels:	only one available for large parties
Eating places:	insufficient, need more affordable and later opening
Public Toilets:	insufficient and many being closed down
Public transport:	room for improvement
Harbours:	various developments being improved
Forestry:	no foreseeable additional employment
Water supply:	building in certain areas curtailed due to full capacity, some private supplies unable to expand
Schools:	closures threatened

In summary:

A CMNP could only work if managed from ground level up due to local knowledge, with the use of the regulatory bodies already in place. No other layer of bureaucracy is, therefore, required.

A CMNP would not improve any of the existing infra-structure, which is required now to save our existing businesses. All round sustainable employment, which you state could be created, cannot see where this would come from, except in a advisory/consolatory capacity.

Mull Community Council feels this is likely to have a detrimental effect and may also be in great danger of splitting communities involved.

Our island, is of outstanding natural beauty and has been looked after by land and sea managers in a sustainable managed way for generations. Why change it? If it aint broke don't fix it.

On questioning many people, including visitors, in the short timescale given, (some from Park areas) there were very few in favour of a CMNP, especially in this area.

Of the largest employers on the island, could a CMNP stop their employment (we do not want to take that risk). If enforced, families would be forced to leave the island and no CMNP could rectify this

On behalf of Mull Community Council, we do not want a CMNP in its present proposed form.

Yours sincerely

Linda Cameron

Mrs. Linda Cameron
Chairperson, Mull Community Council