

**Peak District Local Access Forum
Access Sub-group
Aldern House
8 April 2014**

Attendees:

John Thompson (Chair), Bob Berzins, Henry Folkard, Caroline Hanson, Terry Howard, Sue Weatherley, Gill Millward, Sue Smith

Apologies:

Edwina Edwards, Charlotte Gilbert, Clare Griffin, James Kellie, Mary Bagley, Mike Rhodes

1. Review of Directions

Sue S summarised the situation relating to statutory review of long-term directions to restrict access on open access land. She was currently reviewing the directions at Deer Hill, Diggle, and West Nab and Members were asked for any comments that they wished to make. All 3 sites had restrictions to exclude the public by virtue of shooting take place.

ACTION: John T to prepare a response to the review consultations for the 3 sites (see Annex 1)

2. Derbyshire County Council Access Land

Gill provided details of an area of access land at Combs Moss, Buxton. The LAF's views are sought on potential access improvements. Gill advised that a further site visit would be required to update Members on the present access situation.

ACTION: Gill and Sue S to visit and report back to the next sub-group meeting.

3. Stannage Update

The NPA held a workshop in March 2014 and are currently updating the management plan and refreshing the vision for the estate. A survey is seeking views on the vision. A further workshop is to be held in May to which the LAF are invited.

ACTION: John T to prepare a response to the survey (see Annex 2).

4. Cowdale/Staden Quarry Planning Application

Henry updated the sub-group on a planning application relating to a bottling plant at a quarry just outside the National Park. The application can be viewed [here](#).

ACTION: John T and Henry to provide a response to the planning application (see Annex 3).

5. Agricultural Policy Reform

John and Henry circulated a draft letter which had been drafted to take on board the concerns raised by Members about access in the ongoing reform of agri-

environmental initiatives. The letter was in response to a consultation on the Strategic Environmental Appraisal of the proposals. It was agreed that the letter should also be sent to local MPs as well as the Minister responsible.

ACTION: John T to respond to the consultation and copy to the Minister and MPs (see Annex 4).

6. Event Management

Sue S reported that a meeting co-ordinated by the NPs to consider large-scale events had taken place. Andy Farmer would report back on this and the work he was doing on event donations to the June meeting of the Forum.

ACTION: Andy Farmer to report to the June Forum meeting.

7. Village Trails

Sue S circulated for comment some guidelines which she had prepared for producing leaflets. The intention was to provide a host resource for leaflets. Contact details and a link to potential sources of funding would also be provided.

ACTION: Sue to keep the LAF informed.

8. Access Points, Stiles, Gates and Gaps

Sue S identified that she was planning to produce guidance on access infrastructure and fences in the National Park. It would refer to the roles and responsibilities of the Highway Authority, Access Authority and landowners and would include matters of accessibility and heritage. The LAF's views would be sought.

ACTION: Sue to consult the LAF.

7. Open Access Anniversary

Further discussions would take place at the next Sub-group meeting.

ACTION: All to consider at the next meeting of the Access Sub-group.

8. Cake of the meeting

Victoria Sponges. Thanks to Charlotte and Sue S.

9. DoNM

Wednesday 16 July 2014 at 10.15am.

Annex 1



Peak District Local Access Forum
c/o Peak District National Park Authority
Aldern House
Baslow Road
Bakewell
Derbyshire DE45 1AE

Sue Smith
Access Officer
Peak District National Park Authority
Aldern House
Baslow Road
Bakewell
Derbyshire
DE45 1AE
29th April, 2014

Dear Sue

Consultation on Review of Directions at Deer Hill, Diggle and West Nab.

Following consideration by the Access Sub Group of the Peak District Local Access Forum's Access Sub Group on 8th April and consultation on a draft letter, I am writing to set out our comments

In the Peak District National Park, the National Park Authority has the statutory responsibility for dealing with long- term restrictions in consultation with the Local Access Forum, other relevant consultees and the public. The cases below are at their second review under the CROW Act.

The role of the Access Forum is to advise on the improvement of public access and opportunities for the purpose of open-air recreation and enjoyment of the area. In that context the Access Sub Group considered the notifications below having regard to the interests of the public in having access to the land, whether the restriction is still necessary in relation to its original purpose and whether its extent and nature are still appropriate.

With these criteria in mind, our responses to the 3 current consultations are that the LAF would welcome more access in the future if opportunities arose and/or circumstances allowed it. More specifically:

- 1. Deer Hill Range** - Sites A, B and C - This review was raised at the 13th March LAF meeting and referred to the Sub Group for detailed response. The rifle range is outside the National Park boundary near Meltham, but the fall of shot area within it. At the previous review, there was agreement on modified fall of shot areas being contained within the area of ownership, and to some climbing which is enjoyed and popular. The climbing venue is called Shooters' Nab. Most of the climbing is on, or to the right of, a feature called the Rostrum. This conveniently falls just outside the fall of shot area. The same is true of the descent. We gather that there is not an issue with climbers about the rest of the venue at this time. The fall of shot area must be kept under review. If it changes the area of open access will need to be reviewed. We gather that there is no West

Yorkshire/Pennines LAF for the area outside the National Park and our comments on the extent of the direction are also pertinent to the usage of the rifle range. It is understood that use by the Police by agreement with the Club has increased. Our conclusion and advice is that we would like to see improvements previously negotiated and agreed with the Club (including Climbing) sustained, but with more improvements made over time (e.g. particularly Guided Walks which should be accommodated), and gather these are under consideration.

2. Diggle Rifle Range - it seems as though this Range is not as intensively used now by the police, but firing is in all directions and those participating can turn up at any time with the main shooting area being the Range. Our view was that the aim should be to allow permissive access at certain times with scope for a nice access point through the site from Diggle and the rifle Range to Broadhead Moss and for climbing on Ravenstone Rocks.

3. West Nab - the land is used for clay pigeon shooting, and rifle/pistol testing. There is a concessionary linear route (mainly through Open Country), which links from the south - western boundary to West Nab. Shooting takes place at and is conditional on this linear access being available. On a recent visit by Terry Howard (LAF Member), there was no signage or waymarking on the route agreed, and it would appear people are gaining access anywhere from along the adjacent road over the broken down wall. As the site is completely open from the road anyone wanting to cross the site can see if shooting is taking place. We wish to see signing and waymarking implemented and maintained by the owner in future. If there is no shooting taking place, is there scope to significantly reduce the restrictions or even for there to be no restrictions? Although not discussed in the Sub Group, I suggest that the link path could become definitive to give greater certainty in the long term as not all the land it crosses is designated as access to open country? This is important as the area is very popular and links to other access areas round about.

I hope this information is sufficient and the comments helpful and look forward to hearing the outcome of negotiations and decisions in each case please.

Yours sincerely

John
John Thompson

Chair, Access Sub Group and Vice Chair
Peak District Local Access Forum

Copies to: Edwina Edwards (Chair), all LAF members, Mike Rhodes (Secretary) and Gill Millward (Derbyshire County Council)

Annex 2

Stanage Survey

People who love the spectacular Stanage and North Lees landscape near Hathersage are invited help to create a new vision for the future of the estate.

Last September the Authority voted unanimously to retain ownership of the estate as a public asset. The Authority is working with the Stanage Forum, a voluntary group of local people and recreational users and other interested parties, to create a new management plan for the estate, of which the vision will be the first stage.

We want to hear why it is important to people, what issues they think the estate will face over the next 10 years, and how we can work together to sustain the estate environmentally, recreationally and financially to give it the best possible future.

1. Why is the Stanage and North Lees estate important to you?

One could argue that no tract of land in the Peak District is of greater importance. It is an iconic and outstanding area for recreation and public access, popular for climbing (renowned for that worldwide with Stanage Edge providing the backbone), walking and recreational enjoyment.. In many ways it is the "Jewel in the Crown" of Estates owned (or formerly owned) by the Authority. North Lees is a publically owned and a much cherished area of land with, outstanding landscape, wildlife and strong cultural heritage.

It is in public ownership, acquired for the public by Peak District NPA with public money. It is characterised as belonging to the Authority, whilst it is in fact in essence a much cherished and enjoyed "public property" and outstanding climbing resource close to Sheffield - one of the largest cities in the UK. The Estate is also important for the local community. Its not just a visitor place, but effectively the birthright of people who live there, and what underpins their local economy.

We would like to see a clear statement of future Vision for North Lees in the context of the National Park Management Plan and related plans like the Recreation Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan. That seems particularly relevant as the North Lees Management Plan ran for the period 2002 - September 2012. A review would be welcome to ensure a holistic (rather than piecemeal), and integrated approach to the future in the National Park interest because farming, conservation, visitor use and management are all interrelated. This holistic approach was taken with the excellent Trails Management Plan over the last couple of years. It can provide a sound basis for future action, management and investment. It would benefit by being consistent and integrated with the Eastern Moors & Sheffield Estate partnership plans.

The review is welcome and should ensure a holistic (rather than piecemeal), and integrated approach to the future in the National Park interest because farming, conservation, visitor use and management are all interrelated. For the Vision, the second purpose should be embraced so suggest adding the words in blue below. This can no doubt be refined.

To care for and enjoy Stanage/the North Lees Estate in a way which respects and enhances wildlife, heritage and landscape and ensures good recreational access and understanding of the area's special qualities.

2. Over the next ten years which are the issues (positive and negative) you think that Stanage and North Lees estate will face?

The Public Good -because it is public land, one should surely begin with the vision and demonstrate how it can best be delivered for the public good, and not for commercial benefit.

Availability of resources needed to invest and implement in line with the Management Plan and ways in which that can be addressed and supported.

Recreation needs and demands may change, and should be assessed in relation to the special character and qualities of the Estate

Commercial Approach - any commercial model must embrace the demise on HLS after 31 July, 2017 (ie within the term of any 5 year tenancy agreement), and its replacement by NELMS where priorities are likely to be in line with Lawton (more, bigger, better, joined up). Two points follow: any robust commercial assessment must assume nil income from HLS, since none can be guaranteed, and secondly any vision must have regard to the wider landscape.

3. How can communities of users and residents work together to support the sustainability of the Stanage and North Lees Estate?

Stanage Forum and Voluntary input - It has been realised for some time that the "voluntary sector" and local people should be involved in decision making on things that they have an interest in. Indeed the present Government has encouraged the involvement of volunteers and local people in local decision making. The "Stanage Forum" was the perfect vehicle for doing just that over all the North Lees Estate. It was ahead of its time and became a perfect example of public participation.

The Stanage Forum raised the profile of the North Lees Estate and made it more accessible, in terms of interest and involvement. To the extent people could easily identify with it. It is a "special place" well worth visiting and exploring its special qualities. The Forum provided the opportunities for this to happen to the extent many paths were created and "open access " enhanced. Areas of cultural heritage and wildlife became more accessible.

4. How might Stanage and/or the North Lees estate generate more of its own funds in the future, whilst protecting what makes it special?

There seem to be five options.

First, to raise income through commercial endeavour, though that might require prior investment. At North Lees, the cruck barn complex is an obvious example, and currently a wasted resource. Funds are available for rural enterprises and for restoration of historic buildings. It would be good to know what initiatives officers have taken in this respect, and if and why they have neglected to take any.

Second, membership organisations with significant depth of resource and experience may be better placed to raise funding through public appeal (and a membership base in the millions), than government bodies.

Third, initiate some kind of visitor pay back scheme. There are models elsewhere, none of which may be right for the Peak, but something along those lines may present a broadly

based option with significant potential, though one should not disguise the fact it would be difficult to initiate. This needs very careful thought and is a topic we hope to receive a presentation about at a future LAF meeting.

Fourth, initiate payment for access (which we would regard as unacceptable). This implies inventing ways of charging the public, both visitors and community, for accessing or enjoying public open space. A gloss on this is extracting income from grants available (in the short term) to the farming tenant or commandeering any profit he is able to generate.

Fifth, PDNPA still receives substantial sums from government to which we all contribute to through taxation. It is reasonable to argue that meeting much of the cost of what underpins the essence of the National Park should be met from these public funds which, to the casual observer, are currently directed more to the cost of administration than to custodianship of the landscape.

Diversification within a developed commercial package centred around the cruck barn offers a better prospect for the farming tenant, whether as entrepreneur or caretaker, but we realise there are planning issues involved. Commercialism is to an extent the nub of the matter, and we would agree a very proper consideration.

One should perhaps acknowledge a fundamental problem that those who own (or are custodians of) large tracts of open access land tend not to benefit from the significant income these generate. The trails are a good example where private operators make money from cycle hire without having to meet the cost of Trail maintenance.

One point on which we have no clarity is the scope of the Smith Gore consultancy exercise for the Authority, and its relationship with any decision members took in September.

5. What are your thoughts on protecting the richness of the natural environment on the Stange and North Lees estate?

This is vital and the existing Management Plan is strong on this

6. What opportunities are there to encourage responsible recreational use of the Stange and North Lees Estate?

Access and Routes - It seems to us that whatever the future ownership and management of North Lees may be, the NPA/Access Authority could dedicate all the access/climbing land (under the provisions of the CROW Act,2000), as an excellent example of good practice. Is that an approach you are considering along with dedicating any present/planned concession routes as public rights of way? We have added some detailed suggestions on access and routes below in Annex B for consideration please. Are you open to these and other suggestions for enhancement of recreation opportunities given the knowledge and experience of our members?

On the Camp Site - the 60 pitch site has been managed in accordance with

the aims and objectives of the Stange/North Lees Estate Management Plan, principally to meet the requirements of recreational users and promoting understanding of visitors to the area. It is a key facility for Climbers and is also seen by many D of E groups (who are doing either Silver or Gold), as a good base but there is little promotion on the website to suggest that it is suitable. Liaison with the D of E could be useful in this area and enable greater useage which would be booked in advance.

It is basically well managed, the major limiting factor is weather. Its policy of small tents only maximises occupancy, and therefore income, but you can only go so far on that because of limits on fire regulations and hygiene. Facilities have had no upgrade and are basic, but clean. More people require more toilets etc. Also, the water supply is by spring, not by main, and if you had more people there it could well dry up. Its clientele generally go there on whim, at the last moment. It could provide a diversification opportunity for the farm, but surely in this case it belongs rather with the crucial 'engagement with users' role. This should be discharged by staff of whomsoever manages the public face of the estate.

Given the nature and use of that Camp Site, has consideration been, or could be, given to letting it to an appropriate user group to operate?

Access and Rights of Way Suggestions Annex B

The moorland area is CROW access land with the exception of the Plantation, Dennis Knoll and the Jubilee Plantation. What climbers call "The Plantation" is marked on the map as Stanage Plantation. It is effectively open access, and not problematic and exclusion of the other two sites is not a problem. However, it is an anomaly as both Sheepwash Bank and Ridgeway Side plantations are open access (though old signs around Sheepwash Bank, if they are still there, would lead you to believe otherwise).

Dedication of land along Hood Brook, around the mill pond, Holy Trinity Well and Chapel is desirable. In practice this is not a huge issue, but whilst there is an opportunity to rationalise things it would be a good idea to formalise.

The very popular path along the top of the Edge is a concessionary footpath - described as Sheffield Country Walk. Terry Howard was instrumental in establishing another concessionary footpath on Ridgeway Side, and he is certainly keen to safeguard this. There is scope to extend the footpath network on Ridgeway Side on a broadly an east - west axis to link with Hood Brook; to review the position on Sheepwash bank; to allow a direct route from the chapel to the Ranger Station.

A bridleway concession exists between the Ranger Station and North Lees Hall, which links with the Plantation Bridleway. It would be wonderful to extend this into Hathersage to create a through bridleway from Redmires, but both Cowclose and Brookfield Manor are private land, and there unfortunately seems little prospect of landowners agreeing to any upgrade of extant footpaths to bridleway.

There is a strong view that the Sheffield Country Walk route should not be upgraded to bridleway, though inevitably there is another view there too!

Within the Sheffield Moors Partnership proposals there are many new access route proposals, and it would be nice to think PDNPA property played its part in those partnership discussions which does not seem to be happening.

John Thompson
Vice Chair
Peak District Local Access Forum
8 April, 2014

Annex 3



Peak District Local Access Forum
c/o Peak District National Park Authority
Aldern House
Baslow Road
Bakewell
Derbyshire DE45 1AE

Mrs J Colley
Development Control section
Development Services
High Peak Borough Council
Town Hall
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK17 6EL
June, 2014

2nd

Dear Mrs Colley

Proposed Construction of Water Bottling Plant & Associated Offices, Storage Areas & Parking at Cowdale Quarry, King Sterndale (Application Code: HPK/2014/0023).

As the statutory body advising the Peak District National Park Authority and Derbyshire County Council on recreation and access matters within the Peak District Local Access Forum's (LAF) area; we wish to register concerns about the above planning application which was drawn to the attention of our Access Sub Group on 8th April..

We are appointed jointly by the Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) and Derbyshire County Council (DCC). The LAF covers the National Park area and the countryside of north-west Derbyshire around Buxton, New Mills and Glossop. It includes the area of the above application. Our role is to act as a statutory advisor to both the authorities on the improvement of public access and opportunities for the purpose of open-air recreation and enjoyment of the area. In doing this, we have due regard to the needs of land management and conservation of the natural beauty of the area. The Forum represents a wide range of different interests (recreation, conservation and land management and user groups), and takes a balanced view of issues.

Our concerns are that the site has been used and enjoyed informally for recreation, including climbing, for many years, but although the Environmental Statement mentions access it does not seem to provide assurances for access to continue. We urge that this can be reflected and provided for the benefit of existing users and future generations regardless of whether or not the application is approved.

We welcome the fact that paragraphs 10.3.10 – 10.3.13 in the Environmental Statement cover pedestrian and cyclist access and Figure 10.5 provides possible connections to existing cycle routes. Paragraph 10.3.11 mentions early consideration given to upgrading the existing footpath to a greenway and mentions about a new Greenway route. In 10.3.12 mention is made about speaking to the project managers for the Peak Park about the proposed cycle route. In fact Derbyshire County Council is now leading on this project so additional dialogue is needed with them.

A concern was expressed that during the construction phase, traffic (HGVs included) should be prevented from gaining access from the A515 along the lanes into Cowdale which are currently well used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and which could be a potential link for the White Peak Loop to get people across from the Monsal Trail to Staker Hill to avoid any negative impact on this use.

The Peak District LAF believes its work on Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP's) – Derbyshire's was rated the top of 25 participating authorities in 2013 in terms of public satisfaction with the local rights of way network - and other access provision is key to sustaining and improving access provision. If we are unable to respond to evolving demands and compromise proper regard for maintenance of the current provision and networks; we fear major negative economic impact. There may also be implications for the health agenda which benefits directly from provision and awareness of appropriate access. In that context, we feel sustaining access opportunities at Cowdale Quarry should be addressed.

In Summary, we would want to see the existing recreational use retained. We believe it is possible to accommodate climbing and other access within the site and its environs without significant detriment to or from the proposed development. In addition, we welcome the comments in the environmental statement (paras 10.3.10 - 10.3.13), about potential access improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding in the area; we would like to see more commitment to building and maintaining these routes included in the planning application or planning conditions.

In accordance with our statutory remit, we would be pleased to advise on further proposals to safeguard and enhance recreational provision. In the meantime please accept this as a formal representation to the above planning application and please also notify the LAF of any further information that is submitted in relation to this application and of the decision in due course.

.


Yours sincerely

John
John Thompson

Chair, Access Sub Group and Vice Chair
Peak District Local Access Forum

Copies to: Edwina Edwards (Chair), all LAF members, Mike Rhodes (Secretary), Sue Smith (Peak District NPA) and Gill Millward & Claire O'Reilly (Derbyshire County Council)

Annex 4

 The logo for the Peak District Local Access Forum. It features a stylized landscape with a blue river winding through green hills, all contained within a circular frame. Below the frame is a rectangular box with the text "PEAK DISTRICT LOCAL ACCESS FORUM" in green capital letters.	<p>Peak District Local Access Forum c/o Peak District National Park Authority Aldern House Bakewell Baslow Road Derbyshire DE45 1AE</p>
---	---

CAP Consultation
Defra
Area 1D
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR

Dear Sir or Madam
8th April, 2014

Sent by email to

capconsultation@defra.gsi.gov.uk

and

alex.white@urs.com

Rural Economy and Access Provision

As the statutory body advising on recreation and access matters within the Peak District, we are pleased to see that the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), deals with the recognition of the mental and physical health benefits of exercise and access to green space and the countryside and the benefit of increasing levels of economic activity to improve community sustainability (topic 6).

However, we believe that the lack of explicit reference and support for access and recreation in the proposals relating to the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), in conjunction with other measures, may have the unintended consequence of combining to have a negative impact upon our rural economy.

The following reasons we believe are relevant:

1. The quality of the National Park environment, and opportunities for access to it, are primary drivers for our local economy. In 2012, tourism was estimated to be worth over £431 million per annum to the national park economy, support around 7000 jobs, and results in 10.7 million visitor days per annum. Returns typically accrue to local communities and underpin opportunities for diversification, particularly in upland areas.
2. Access is currently the victim of hits from a number of angles. These include squeezing of rights of way budgets and associated staff posts; discontinuity of landscape scale resource and thinking as facilitated by Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs); demise of provision within High Level Stewardship (HLS) which facilitates concessionary access; reduction in available resource through the New Environmental Land Management Scheme (NELMS); the impact of restricted

modulation between Pillars 1 and 2; and apparent restriction in what may be funded under Pillar 2 where this affects access provision on the ground.

3. We see the environment and access to it as interlinked and mutually dependent elements of our rural economy. In turn delivery of a number of other important agendas are reliant thereupon e.g. health, water quality, carbon retention, biodiversity, well being and quality of life. We find any distinction between farming on the one hand and environmental measures on the other unhelpful. There is only one landscape and the common challenge must surely be to effect the best returns from it for all users and interests.
4. There is evidence to show that diversification is generally more reduced in upland areas and also where there are smaller holdings due to lack of opportunities and/or ability to give time and effort to activities away from the main activity of farming. It is important therefore that access initiatives can still be provided and be encouraged as these may have the potential to lead ultimately to diversification. In addition, concessionary access may become more permanent over time meriting an approach for one-off payments that encourage its introduction as a means of trial.
5. Education through understanding and enjoyment is an integral part of National Parks. Educational requirements are and can be met wherever access is provided or enhanced in a National Park and need not be formal in terms of the provision of a certain number of visits by groups.

We consider that there is the room to review provision for concessionary access and rights of way whether as a means to facilitate improvements in the rural economy, or enhance the environment, educational and access opportunities of National Parks. Opportunities to provide and upgrade access in accord with the least restrictive principle to meet the public sector equality duty, and to ensure that access land remains easily accessible, also needs to be given due regard in all proposals.

Annex A provides supporting information to this letter about the role of this Local Access Forum (LAF), relevant policies, the importance of access and recreation provisions to the health of the local economy, the importance of the attractive environment and quality of access for people's health and well being and the proud record the Peak District has in facilitating improvements to access.

I would be grateful for your consideration and response to these issues please, and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

John

John Thompson
Chair Access Sub Group and
Vice Chair
Peak District Local Access Forum

Annex A

Background about the Forum and Supporting Information

Peak District Local Access Forum

1. This is a statutory body, appointed jointly by the Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) and Derbyshire County Council (DCC). It covers the National Park area and the countryside of north-west Derbyshire around Buxton, New Mills and Glossop. Our role is to act as a statutory advisor to both the authorities on the improvement of public access and opportunities for the purpose of open-air recreation and enjoyment of the area. In doing this, we have due regard to the needs of land management and conservation of the natural beauty of the area. The Forum represents a wide range of different interests (recreation, conservation and land management) and user groups and takes a balanced view of issues.

Strategic Background

2. We support the National Park Management Plan and key priorities related to these issues from our point of view are - "the diverse national park landscapes will respond to challenges whilst retaining their special qualities and natural beauty" (NPMP DL1). "the National Park will strengthen its role as a welcoming place and premier destination, synonymous with escape, adventure and enjoyment" (NPMP - W11). "Accessible and diverse recreation opportunities will be available for all, encouraging healthy living, enjoyment of the landscape and a sense of adventure." (NPMP W14).

3. The Recreation Strategy advocates - "The Peak District will be a welcoming place, providing good access for all and quality facilities. Everyone will have the opportunity to enjoy and benefit from healthy outdoor experiences, contribute to the local economy and become more aware of the special qualities of the National Park. There will be a network of transport routes linked to popular sites and any conflicts between recreation, residents and the management of the environment will be addressed. More people will have better information, a greater choice of activities, and more sustainable ways of enjoying them. The National Park will thrive because more people will both enjoy and care for it." (Para 1.5).

4. Linking the conservation and recreation objectives referred to above has worked well in the Peak District and needs to be sustained in terms of existing outputs and future opportunities. This is covered very well in Recreation Strategy para regarding a spatial approach and landscape character (something the Peak did as pioneering work amongst the National Parks) - "....By adopting a spatial approach, the demands of recreation and conservation of highly sensitive environments can be delivered successfully and an appropriate balance achieved." (Para 4.2.1).

5. Sustaining and developing this approach has helped with provision of additional access and route opportunities in the Peak, through land management grants, which are being enjoyed and are not in conflict with conservation. We strongly believe that the approach to future payments under present CAP reforms should support continuity of this approach.

6. Whilst our raison d'être concerns access provision we are always mindful that the health of our rural economy must be uppermost in our work. The mainstay of that economy is tourism and recreation. An important characteristic of this economy is that structurally the returns are to local communities very largely through market driven opportunities for land based diversification. Indeed, the benefit is that such opportunities do much to sustain upland farming.

7. What attracts visitors is perception of an attractive environment and quality of access to it besides availability of appropriate facilities and infrastructure. There is a real sense in which the economic base is indistinguishable from the quality of the environment. Thus measures which may have negative impact upon the environment and access to it will in turn depress local economic prosperity and growth.

8. The Peak District National Park has a proud record of facilitating access, which has been repaid by enhancing the well being of the local community. Indeed the long term legacy of the celebrated events upon Kinder scout in 1932 has been the burgeoning of a massive industry of accommodation, outdoor equipment, information, hospitality and rural enterprise, none of which existed before open access under the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act, 2000 provided the extra driver to bring visitors to the area.

9. The Peak District LAF believes its work on Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP's) – Derbyshire's was rated the top of 25 participating authorities in 2013 in terms of public satisfaction with the local rights of way network - and other access provision as key in taking forward that impetus. If we are unable to respond to evolving demands and compromise proper regard for maintenance of the current provision and networks; if pressures upon land managers lead to degradation in the quality of landscape and biodiversity we fear major negative economic impact. There may also be implications for the health agenda which benefits directly from provision and awareness of appropriate access.

10. Economic activity within the Peak District is diverse. The economy is predominantly made up of farming, land management, manufacturing, and the accommodation and retail [sectors](#). Many businesses within the national park derive either a direct or indirect economic benefit from their unique location and relationship with the [landscape](#). It is this relationship that we seek to foster in order to deliver [national park purposes](#).

John Thompson