

Peak District Local Access Forum - Thursday 15th June, 2017

Item 6

Peak District National Park Management Plan Review - Background Report from John Thompson

Introduction

1. We have had previous presentations and fed comments into the Peak District National Park Management Plan Review.

2. At this meeting Emily Fox will highlight the key elements of the Review which has been agreed for consultation and response to the Authority and I have in Annex A included previous comments I have fed in via Emily and the National Park Management Plan Advisory Group where I have represented the LAF at recent meetings which are chaired by Diane Jeffrey. Jon Stewart is also on the Advisory Group as a National Trust representative, and Allison Thomas and Richard Taylor represent Derbyshire County Council. There is a very good partnership approach in that Group and its constitution is being reviewed as the NPMP Review work moves forward through consultation to implementation as a Plan for the Peak District.

3. It has been suggested at the Advisory Group that people could raise awareness of the matter through their networks.

4. Recommendation

1. That the LAF welcomes the consultation, considers how to respond to the consultation and who should lead and be involved in this in the light of presentation and discussion at this meeting.

2. That LAF members help to raise awareness of the review, timescale for comments and questionnaire through their networks and contacts.

National Park Management Plan Review

Response to Initial Comments put Forward on behalf of the Peak District LAF from Emily Fox by email on 16th May, 2017

Hi John

Once again, many thanks for your comments on a draft version of the National Park Management Plan consultation document. As promised, here is a full response to your comments, as I hope some of my responses will help inform the LAF's discussion around the final consultation document and your response to the public consultation. For ease of reference, I have used your headings in my responses below.

1. **Name and terms of reference** – We would like to take you up on your offer to help with this, and will be in touch when we've had some time to work on this. **(Meeting Arranged)**
2. **Overview** – I can understand why you have suggested an additional appendix of other plans and strategies that already exist, but in this consultation, we didn't want to make the document any longer than it already is. It isn't something anyone else has raised in this early engagement process, so we weren't sure how many people would look at it. I have tried to clarify the 'we' and remove typos in the document.
3. **Special Qualities** – there is reference to the campaign for access in special quality 6: **An inspiring space for escape, adventure, exploring and quiet reflection**
The Peak District National Park is bordered on all sides by major conurbations, bringing it within reach of millions and providing a rural oasis in stark contrast to its urban neighbours. Although today many visitors take access for granted, prior to 1949 the majority of its moorland and hills had no public access. People were passionate about accessing Kinder Scout for exploration and adventure, so it became the stage for the Kinder Mass Trespass in 1932. This and other similar protests reflected the mood for greater public access to the uplands, leading to the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. National parks were then established as places of escape and enjoyment, with the Peak District National Park being the first in 1951.
4. **Infographic and maps** – we are including the final infographic and some diagrammatic maps in the consultation document. There will be a map of the whole of the National Park, so people can refer to it throughout, and also one of the main landscape partnership areas, as we had feedback that this would be helpful.
5. **Areas of Impact**
 - a. Topic Papers - The topic papers are an appendix to the consultation document, but these are background papers should anyone want additional detail, but do not form part of the consultation.
 - b. Area of Impact 2 - We haven't reordered the areas of impact, but have made it clear that they should be read together and that they are not in order of priority.
 - c. Area of Impact 3 – public access – I haven't been able to make a change to add in reference to continuing the CROW Act or access fund, as these are key corporate actions for the Authority, rather than partnership based activities. They are therefore 'business as usual' activities, which we agreed these types of things wouldn't be in the NPMP, as this should illustrate added value over and above what is already happening.
 - d. Area of Impact 3 – understanding and enjoyment - Under the intention of 'ensure shared responsibility', I have added to the words in bold 'We want people to

appreciate, understand and *care* about the impacts they have on the National Park and other users’.

- e. Area of Impact 3 – Recreation routes - – I haven’t been able to make a change to add in the references you mention, as these are key corporate actions for the Authority, rather than partnership based activities. They are therefore ‘business as usual’ activities, which we agreed these types of things wouldn’t be in the NPMP, as this should illustrate added value over and above what is already happening.
6. **Area of Impact 5** – This area of impact was called ‘public benefits’ in a previous version, but we have now simply called it ‘benefits, as ‘public benefits’ means different things to different people. So we have tried to keep the wording as simple as possible, especially as this is a public consultation document.
7. **Area of impact 6** – It was this comment, alongside ones from others, that has led me to state at the beginning of the areas of impact that they should be read together and that they are not in order of priority. Hopefully this reminds people that we wouldn’t want to pursue one area of impact at the expense of others, and that where there are positives for more than one area of impact, that is even better.
8. **LAF meeting 15th June** – As now agreed with you, we will present the consultation paper to the LAF and update you on the timings of the consultation. – This is subject to Members approving the recommendations in their paper on 26th May.

I hope this detailed response enables you to see where I have been able to take your comments into account, and where I haven’t felt able to, my reasons why. If you have any questions on my response, please let me know.

Kind regards
Emily

My email to Emily of 26th April after soundings of some LAF Colleagues who asked to be involved were:

Hi Emily - As a follow up to the meeting and your email, my comments reflecting on the meeting yesterday and for the most part also previously in a note I sent to Paul Tiplady (consultant) ahead of the draft are:

1. Name and terms of reference - good to review with consultation by email ahead of or for the July 25th meeting. Happy to contribute thoughts if you can "dig out" the present terms of reference and indicate what else you and Sarah would like the Group to do in future. There are some sensitivities, but advantages to including Partnership in the name.

2. Overview - I think the general tone is fine especially as there are so many unknowns with Brexit and funding. It is positive and hopefully will enable more people to be engaged within the National Park. From my involvement to date as a member of the NPMP Advisory Group, I think the document is fair, says the right things and covers the issues well. It would be helpful somewhere early on to indicate what other Plans (Local Plan?) cover things readers might have thought were covered and key Strategies (eg Landscape, Recreation, Cultural Heritage) exist on specific topics – “Wider Peak District Cycling Strategy” was outward looking and secured national and Partner funds working together . Perhaps they could be listed in an Appendix
At several points the word “We” is used – who is that referring to? There are a few typos – e.g. “bridal” ways under Special Quality no 6.

3. Special Qualities - the information Joe Glentworth sent me re yesterday about how our previous comments and suggestions re the 8 Special Qualities had been dealt with was most helpful (See Joe's note below and the 2015 Special Qualities attached) Personally I think they are appropriate now. **In Appendix 1, it would seem appropriate to recognise the special place of the Peak District re the campaign for Access and the pioneering work to lobby and implement that under the NP. etc Act, 1949 and the CROW Act, 2000.**

4. The Infograph - which was tabled, but not referred to in the meeting, is very good in highlighting with facts and figures the "Benefits that the Peak District National Park provides." **Will it be included together with some maps and other illustrations in the consultation draft?**

5. Areas of Impact - the Topic papers referred to in the Introduction could usefully be in an Appendix. There were a number of points aired in the meeting on presentation and content in a very good Draft . I offer the following as my additional suggestions with **key points in bold** for consideration please:

Impact 2 – Getting the Most for the Peak District National Park – after discussion yesterday this is important, but needs careful wording as applies to all other areas – **perhaps it should therefore switch to No 8 and avoid reading as though just about conserving the area?**

Impact 3 – Encouraging Enjoyment with Understanding – I guess the points below should relate to this:

Access - Every so often in the Draft reference is made to the possible consequences of "Brexit" or leaving the European Union. The CROW Act, 2000 at present still has not reached it potential, there is no mention yet about the mapping review (deferred from 2014). What we need to know is the CROW Act safe, will its aspirations be fulfilled and we don't want to see or experience the access work of years of campaigning and working for access lost. Thus with several LAF colleagues I have consulted, we would wish to see in the document - **the continuing support, sustaining, improvement and further implementation of public access as contained in the CROW Act. The continuation of promotion and "ring fencing" of the innovative "Access Fund" by the NPA is crucial to future access improvements throughout the National Park. Access opportunities to water should be given greater impetus as a challenge for the future.**

Understanding and Enjoyment - We want visitors to be inspired, not just understand the park but be thrilled and excited. **As I said yesterday, beyond understanding is 'caring about'. With this kind of experience comes support for the Park which can be manifest in all kinds of ways- volunteers, word of mouth spread of information, possible financial support and so on. The National Park is not just a tourist attraction it is special, a National Treasure.**

Partnership Approach - I strongly agree with the suggestion for a future White Peak project – that's a clear gap that needs to be filled as that way of working has been successful in many other areas of the work (like Moors for the Future as mentioned in the Draft and yesterday), and is fundamental to achieving implementation of action through the NPMP. The need for sustaining "Moors for the Future" funding beyond its current funded partnership is vital – an issue for government support based on real achievements and future needs.

Recreation Routes - Government and Natural England should continue to be lobbied (we are doing that) to **ensure the profile of National Trails is raised and funding planned ahead and provided for National Park Authorities and Local Authorities to sustain and maintain these visionary national assets. In the case of the wider Peak District that includes the Pennine Way, as well as completion of the Pennine Bridleway section around Glossop.**

The scope for Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP's) by Local Highway Authorities to be vehicles for partnership delivery (the Derbyshire model is one we have most experience of working together with the neighbouring Derby and Derbyshire LAF), should be stressed, along with the Wider Peak District Cycling Strategy, improved Horse Riding Circuit loops and circuits, and as with other National Parks, strong support for "Miles without Stiles" to increase access opportunities Park Wide for everyone to enjoy.

Impact 5 – I prefer inserting "Public" before Benefits in the title for this one.

That is encouraging and vital and worth referring to to get an integrated approach, including access benefits.

Impact 6 – Securing a future for Farming and Land Management – In looking for securing future land management support schemes, please remember access, tourism and understanding are crucial to an integrated approach and build on previous work and initiatives in the Peak District

Good to ensure links to Defra priorities for NPA's as Jon Stewart mentioned yesterday

6. Consultation with the Local Access Forum - I will liaise with Mike, Edwina and Jon Stewart as a member of the LAF about how best to handle this and the likely time available with a document available on line and as a pdf. at the 15th June meeting. Will you be coming along to that meeting. Happy to do an overview and encourage LAF involvement (including links to organisations, user groups etc if you wish).

Hope all goes well at the Authority meeting this Friday, and best of luck with amending the draft as necessary after what will have been 3 meetings of Managers, Advisory Group and NPA members this week!

I have copied Sarah and Matt in as officers present with you at the meeting yesterday, and Edwina, Jon Stewart, Mike Rhodes, Sue Smith and Gill Millward and am happy to clarify any points if needs be.

Kind regards

John my personal views with some soundings
John Thompson Vice Chair for
Peak District Local Access Forum

Special Qualities Update from Joe Glentworth

Hi John,

Good to hear from you. I won't be at the meeting today but you will meet a new member of our team Matt Mardling and Emily will also be attending. Hopefully the information below will be useful but let me know if you need anything else.

As you are aware we have consulted with a range of stakeholders on these statements and tried to take on board all the comments we received in a balanced way. The statements have evolved during this process and we feel that this has helped strengthen them and make them more meaningful to a wide range of stakeholders.

Here are a few notes on the specific comments made by LAF:

4. Distinctive settlements with strong communities, great character and traditions – this has now changed to ‘Characteristic settlements with strong communities and traditions’ which hopefully captures your comments.

5. A lived in landscape shaped by people and industry since prehistoric times – we feel that the lived in landscape element is captured in number 4 when we describe strong communities and traditions. This statement is more about the working nature of the landscape.

6. Numerous and exceptional opportunities for recreation, wonder, learning experiences and understanding – I think the original statement was ‘limitless opportunities for recreation’ and for obvious reasons LAF wanted this to be amended. This has now changed to ‘A space for escape, adventure, exploring and quiet reflection’ which reflects some of the language in the Access and Recreation Topic Paper and hopefully addresses the point raised here by LAF.

8. Landscapes that provide benefits to society which stretch way beyond their boundary (or within and beyond the national park)- this statement has changed a number of times but is all about the wider benefits that the park provides both inside and outside the park. We feel that this new statement helps to capture this better - ‘Vital benefits for millions of people that flow beyond the landscape boundary’.

These statements are not yet set in stone and we are now using this consultation to present them to a wider audience and make sure they capture what is important about the Peak District National Park. Again, after this consultation we will take on board all feedback in a balanced way as best we can.

We have scheduled in an item on the June LAF to present the NPMP consultation document including the new special qualities. I think this will be part of the discussions in the meeting today.

Best wishes,

Joe