



Glenfinnan Community Facilities SCIO

Callop Forest, Car Park and Visitor Amenities

2025 Survey Results

11 Sep 2025

Results Summary

The Callop Forest, Car Park and Visitor Amenities project evolved in response to the ideas first gathered at a “Vision Day” meeting held on 14 April 2024. The discussion was led by Ann Martin. All Glenfinnan residents were invited to gather and share their ideas for the future of the village. 23 residents attended and a further 5 submitted ideas in writing.

The outcomes from that meeting strongly guided the proposed developments. Draft proposals were presented to residents and followed by a Q&A session at another village meeting, “Tea with the Trustees” on 20 July 2025. 31 residents attended.

Following the presentation, we conducted a poll of residents to quantify the level of support and to surface any concerns.

The poll was run for 9 days, from 23 Aug 2025 to 31 Aug 2025 inclusive. The poll was presented as an online poll, with a link sent to everyone on the village and SCIO membership mailing lists, and as a paper poll, hand delivered to those who are not online.

The poll received 61 responses. The village population includes 99 adults.

Of the 45 respondents who did give their name, 2 are non-residents¹. 16 responses were anonymous, so we cannot verify their residency status.

Support, broken down by proposal, ranges from 81% to 100%.

Question	Proposal	For %	Against %
1	Reinstate the Callop Boardwalk	100%	0%
2	Make Callop River footbridge more accessible	98%	2%
3	Establish themed and guided walks	88%	12%
4	Employ forest manager	95%	5%
5	Short Stay Car Parking	97%	3%
6	Coach Parking	89%	11%
7	Park-n-Ride	93%	7%
8	Long-Stay Parking	92%	8%
9	Campervan Aire	85%	15%
10	Public Toilets	93%	7%
11	Retail Units	83%	17%
12	Café	81%	19%

The raw results are available on request; the following analysis considers the responses to each question and the respondents’ comments where relevant.

¹ Residency is defined in the same way as it is for SCIO membership; Aged 16 and over and living permanently within the Glenfinnan Community Council area OR a property or landowner with property within the Glenfinnan Community Council area OR living in the Glenfinnan Community Council area while working in the local area.

Polling response choices were, strongly support, support, do not support, or strongly do not support. Respondents had the option to give their name or remain anonymous, and to add comments.

Q1 to Q4 relate to activities that will be funded by revenue from the developments inferred by Q5 to Q12.

Q1 Reinstate the Callop Boardwalk

The Callop Boardwalk, a designated core path, connected the Forest Road with the Callop footbridge and was a popular with residents and tourists as a walking and cycling route. It was removed by Forestry and Land Scotland as it was considered unsafe and repair was beyond the available budget.

Polling: 100% in favour

Strongly support	59
Support	2
Do not support	0
Strongly do not support	0

Q2 Make Callop River footbridge more accessible

When the Callop boardwalk was removed, the Callop footbridge was re-configured to include a steep metal stair from the bridge level down to ground level. This is not negotiable on a bicycle and is challenging for less able bodied users. In conjunction with the reinstatement of the boardwalk, we would remodel the link between the bridge and boardwalk to create a more accessible transition.

Polling: 98% in favour

Strongly support	54
Support	6
Do not support	1
Strongly do not support	0

Looking at the comments for the one “do not support”, we may guess that the respondent misinterpreted “accessible” as meaning more easily accessed by tourists.

Q3 Establish themed and guided walks

If the acquisition is successful, we will be taking ownership of 24 ha of woodland which has several protections in place because of its rich flora and fauna. A significant part of the area is regularly flooded by the River Callop so cannot realistically be developed, but the recreational value of the area could be enhanced by creating pathways, which could be themed to add interest.

Polling: 88% in favour

Strongly support	31
Support	22
Do not support	6
Strongly do not support	1
No answer given	1

This was the least popular of the “benefit” proposals, but apart from one respondent, there is no clue in the comments as to why it is less favoured. The one respondent who did comment, did comment favourably on the idea of guided walks, yet responded here as “do not support”.

Q4 Employ forest manager

To properly manage 24 ha of woodland the SCIO felt that it would be appropriate to employ a suitably qualified forest manager. This would give local employment and ensure that the woodland was properly maintained.

Polling: 95% in favour

Strongly support	39
Support	18
Do not support	3
Strongly do not support	0
No answer given	1

Three people did not support this proposal. Two gave no reason; the other did not support any of the proposals except re-instating the Callop Boardwalk.

Q5 Short Stay Car Parking

In this context, short stay refers to a stay of less than 8 hours and we would expect will mainly be people intent on using the park-n-ride facility to visit Glenfinnan.

Polling: 97% in favour

Strongly support	50
Support	8
Do not support	0
Strongly do not support	2
No answer given	1

Two people strongly did not support this proposal. Both gave lengthy comments explaining why they do not support any development at Callop. One respondent was anonymous; the other is not a resident of the Glenfinnan Community Council area.

Q6 Coach Parking

In this context, coach parking refers to parking for tourist coaches. The proposal is that coaches would deposit their passengers at the NTS visitor centre then return to Callop and wait until their passengers are ready to re-embark.

Polling: 89% in favour

Strongly support	47
Support	7
Do not support	4
Strongly do not support	3

Seven people did not support this proposal. The four “do not support” offered no reason. Of the three “strongly do not support”, two were the same non-supporters of any development. The third argued that the coach parking should be closer to the NTS Visitor Centre (as part of a package of other ideas). This feedback will be explored further with the respondent.

Q7 Park-n-Ride

The proposal is that visitors are encouraged to park at Callop (rather than in the village) by offering “airport style” pricing. Inexpensive parking at Callop and a very frequent free bus from Callop to various destinations in the village (NTS, church, station), with premium pricing of the community and NTS car parks as an added disincentive.

Polling: 93% in favour

Strongly support	51
Support	6
Do not support	2
Strongly do not support	2

Four people did not support this proposal. The two “do not support” offered no reason. The two “strongly do not support”, were the same non-supporters of any development.

Q8 Long-Stay Parking

The proposal is to reserve a small number of parking spaces for use by people such as hikers, mountain bikers and kayakers who want to leave their vehicle for several days while they pursue their activity.

Polling: 92% in favour

Strongly support	47
Support	9
Do not support	2
Strongly do not support	3

Five people did not support this proposal. The two “do not support” offered no reason. Of the three “strongly do not support”, two were the same non-supporters of any development. The third offered no reason.

Q9 Campervan Aire

The proposal is to designate a few campervan bays for overnight stays, and to provide those bays with access to electricity, water and blackwater disposal facilities. These bays would be enclosed and would be pre-booked.

Polling: 85% in favour

Strongly support	43
Support	9
Do not support	5
Strongly do not support	4

Nine people did not support this proposal. The five “do not support” offered no reason. Of the four “strongly do not support”, two were the same non-supporters of any development. The remaining two commented, one anonymously, to express strong concerns about turning Callop into a campsite with all the abuses that often come with that. These concerns will be explored further with the identified respondent.

Q10 Public Toilets

The proposal is to provide male, female and disabled toilet facilities with entry controlled by contactless payment, like the NTS toilets.

Polling: 93% in favour

Strongly support	53
Support	4
Do not support	2
Strongly do not support	2

Four people did not support this proposal. The two “do not support” offered no reason. The two “strongly do not support”, were the same non-supporters of any development.

Q11 Retail Units

The proposal is to provide some form of retail outlets, primarily for the use and benefit of small local businesses. The exact nature of this provision would be shaped by the needs of the interested parties (so far 5 local businesses have expressed interest).

Polling: 83% in favour

Strongly support	35
Support	15
Do not support	7
Strongly do not support	3
No answer given	1

Ten people did not support this proposal. Six of the seven “do not support” offered no reason, the seventh questioned the benefit of this proposal. Two of the three “strongly do not support”, were the same non-supporters of any development, the third suggested alternatives which, again, will be explored further with the respondent.

Q12 Café

The proposal is to provide some form of café facility. The exact nature of this provision is undecided. Possibilities range from nothing at all (relying on some of the retail outlets to be food outlets) through a simple “coffee and cakes” stand, to a full-service café.

Polling: 81% in favour

Strongly support	31
Support	16
Do not support	8
Strongly do not support	3
No answer given	3

Eleven people did not support this proposal. Five of the eight “do not support” offered no reason, two were concerned that it might negatively affect businesses in the village, one questioned the benefit of this proposal (along with the retail units). Two of the three “strongly do not support”, were the same non-supporters of any development, the third suggested alternatives which, again, will be explored further with the respondent.

Conclusion

The survey results confirm that support for these proposals from village residents is substantial.

Out of 61 survey responses, 21 did not support one or more of the proposals. Of those, 9 were submitted anonymously and mainly without comments, so are unactionable.

The points of non-support and comments of the remaining 12 identifiable respondents is very useful feedback, it will be taken into consideration and addressed by further discussion.