

Peak District Local Access Forum

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 14 June 2007 at Losehill Hall

Members Present:

Bob Berzins	Andrew McCloy (Chair)
Charlotte Bright	James Kellie
Jon Clennell	Richard Peart
Edwina Edwards	Keith Pennyfather
Stuart Elliott	Alison Salmen
Henry Folkard	Roger Wilkinson
Terry Howard	

Others Present:

Mike Rhodes (PDNPA)	Gill Millward (DCC)
Jane Beech (Natural England)	Geoff Nickolds (PDNPA)
Richard Bonner (DCC)	Max Norris (Institute of Outdoor Learning)
Andy Gardner (Kirklees MBC)	Richard Pett (PDNPA)
Terence Cavanagh (Unity - Oldham MBC)	Sue Smith (PDNPA)
Sue Marriott (PDNPA)	Jenny Waller (PDNPA)
Judy Merryfield (PDNPA)	

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from Andrew Critchlow, Mike Innerdale, Richard Marshall and Lorna Wilson.

The Chair welcomed everyone and introduced Bob Berzins as a new member. Bob gave a brief account of his background – he is a keen fell runner and is a rock climber and is here primarily to represent fell runners. Bob has been interested in the LAF for a long time.

Mike reported that Sarah Harlen has resigned as a member due to pressure of work and the inability to make meetings – therefore a vacancy now exists. There has been one expression of interest but the Chair said please put the feelers out for new members.

ACTION: ALL

Geoff Nickolds has been appointed as a Secretary of State Member for the Peak District National Park Authority and is here today in an observer role. The Chair offered congratulations to Geoff on his appointment.

2. Minutes from the last Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting on 17 March 2007 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

3. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising and the Chair explained that there will be three presentations today.

4. Recreation & Tourism Policy in the National Park, for the new Local Development Framework

The Chair introduced Sue Marriott, Policy Planner from PDNPA. Mike has circulated a copy of Sue Marriott's report to the members. Sue stressed that she was here to listen and not just talk. The Policy team are currently undertaking consultation on issues and options regarding the new Local Development Framework (LDF) so she encouraged LAF members to write to her or one of her colleagues who will be happy to meet and talk face to face if preferred. Evidence (data, proof, survey work etc) is needed for the new system. The new planning system is described as spatial – the land use implications of all sorts of bodies is now to be taken into account. Delivery is also a key aspect – it is important that whatever proposals are being made they can be delivered. There are four key areas in the LDF – summary papers have already been circulated – and all are interlinked.

Sue invited questions on the new planning process or system. The Chair asked about a timetable. Sue said resource issues made setting a timetable difficult. The next stage is to decide which options to propose as the way forward which they are hoping to do by the end of 2007 but to be realistic it will probably be early 2008. These will then be finalised into a plan and submitted to the Secretary of State – that plan is subject to public consultation and examination and eventually the inspector reports - the inspector's report is binding. It will be approximately 2 years until the final report is available.

With regard to consultation, Terry Howard wondered if all organisations should have seen consultation material. Sue confirmed this was the case and if not then let Sue know. She explained that the policy team have been meeting forums like this one, taking to individuals and holding public meetings – especially for those people who have not responded in past and need to be included. Terry said that this would have been perfect to discuss at the recreation forum should it have been held. Sue confirmed that all ideas were welcomed.

Henry Folkard said this was a monumental task. The process is complex and long term – he was worried because the demands of recreation are not static. There was some concern about using an inflexible process to meet changing demand. Henry felt the attitude of the Plan should be enabling rather than directing and managing. Within the document there are a number of phrases that say 'you can't do this' – there are more positive ways of saying these things. This forum and the Stanage forum are finding ways of bridging the interface between recreation and agriculture – the forums have brought a way through – enabling education and understanding issues. There is a need to find a positive way forward in a pressured and cash constrained environment. Sue said it was the intention of Government that the plans process should be quick, easy and flexible - our concerns were voiced that in no way is the system any of those three. We are trying to get it right in the first place but have been told it can easily be revised, revisited and changed as we go through. Some moves have been made to speed things up but we have to work with the system we have. Sue takes the point about being positive.

James Kellie spoke about holiday accommodation – he is unsure who has been consulted on the subject of holiday cottages, B&Bs etc. His personal opinion is that accommodation demand and provision is about balance – people are taking more short breaks, but at peak times the area is short of accommodation. He worries that camping and caravan sites seem to get planning permission much easier than cottage conversions. On the whole he has found that people want high quality accommodation.

Sue explained that the current consultation period is nearly finished. More evidence gathering is needed on subjects like holiday accommodation – they have anecdotal

evidence which seems to contradict itself. It is still open to anybody to make further views known; reports on consultation have to be made but they welcome any views at any time. The PDNPA website has current consultations and previous consultation reports under the 'plans & policies' section.

James responded that the advantage of disseminating information via a website is that it can be kept up to date – which is very important.

Sue then spoke about Recreation Zones – which identify levels of recreation activity and cover the entire Park. Do we need these zones? Views and experiences are welcomed. Henry felt that the major impact on conservation has never been recreation pressure – massive impacts include over-grazing, fire agri-chemicals, climate change, pollution. We should get away from the idea that recreation is a major enemy of conservation and there is an argument against too strict a zoning system as much depends on type of use, time of year etc.

Charlotte Bright said that she farms a small acreage, which includes footpaths, a bridleway, and a rock face popular with climbers. She made a plea for education. People would like to respect the area – there is lots going on and a lot of conflicts within a small space. We should let people know what is expected of them and she felt they will adhere.

Stuart Elliott agreed with Charlotte and said that view needs to be written into this document– there are other pressures caused by recreation – eg motorbikes, hang gliders – there is a big mix and clear long term damage is done by recreation pressures – not just visual but the impact on wildlife. We should educate, but the same message has been mooted for many years but has not made much difference.

The Chair said he would like to know more about recreation zones – possibly one of the most important subjects of this consultation. Forum members should look at this and come back to Sue with opinions. **ACTION: ALL**

Richard Peart said he was not familiar with recreation zones in this country. Sue explained that zones came originally from the National Park Management Plan a long time ago. They were taken into the structure plan and the policy team were told they have to be very specific. These zones are very clear and precise – and are used and needed for development control purposes. At the time they were drawn quickly on a map with professional knowledge of both the area and some of the issues. The Chair felt the LAF should be considering the concept of recreation zones and we should come back and talk about the situation in further detail at a future meeting. Sue encouraged this. The Chair thanked Sue for attending the meeting today.

5. Ranger Service Review

The Chair introduced Jenny Waller from the Ranger Service and said it was unfortunate that Andrew Critchlow was not here today as he was particularly interested in this topic. Jenny said she would give an overview of the whole process. The National Park's Audit & Performance Committee requires a rolling review of all the different services and it has been the ranger service's 'turn'. This was an internal review and the process had been welcomed, the team felt confident and that a review was a good idea. There had not generally been any worry about the process. At the same time as the ranger service review, 2 other areas were under review in addition to the financial challenge due to funding reduction. Several services had to reduce budgets by sizeable amounts. Rangers did so by utilising the fact that 3 area rangers retired at the end of March. These vacancies were filled from an existing pool of 8 full time rangers in order to retain 14 area rangers in the Park. Consequently we are now down to 5 full time rangers but over 250 part time and volunteer rangers are still in post. This event was

separate from the ranger service review. In addition there is on-going restructuring in the organisation - the Chief Executive is reviewing the structure of the organisation – again this is nothing to do with the ranger review.

Audit & Performance Committee appointed 3 committee members and a Director to conduct the review, aided by Andy Farmer, Jenny and Sean Prendergast. In addition, George Broughton, the Countryside Manager for Cheshire County Council was a critical friend. An external consultant facilitated the whole process – they consulted partners, user groups, parish councils and the public. All information was collated and they identified 5 specific areas:

- 1) how the ranger service delivers on NP purposes,
- 2) the geographical spread of the ranger service
- 3) communications between HQ and other staff
- 4) partnership working and
- 5) use of people and resources.

Everyone in the ranger service had been involved. Evidence was gathered and a report produced. The conclusions are that the ranger service is extremely good, doing very well with limited resources.

They requested a review of guided walks – are they a broad enough range; and asked for a review of part time rangers and volunteers – could their skills be used elsewhere in the organisation? This review will take place over the summer. Lessons learnt from the ranger service review were that it was good to appoint an external consultant because it is a complex service – it is a good move to be removed from process. The use of Cheshire CC was good –again an outside person being objective. The involvement of all full time rangers enabled them to understand and support the whole process. It gave members better understanding of rangers' skills and what they deliver. Overall the process was useful and Jenny felt that the team of people had grown and gelled. The Chair thanked Jenny for her report and he asked why the LAF were not involved in the consultation. Jenny replied that the people who steered the process (including consultation) were the members and Director – the rangers had tried to guide but it wasn't their decision. The Chair said the steering group had mentioned partnership working and here we are at the end of the exercise - we are a statutory body but had no input into the process. Jenny stated that several other partners were not consulted either. Henry asked Jenny to please feedback to the relevant director and members that we are disappointed as we do have a statutory function.

Edwina was interested as she is involved in providing transport for guided walks. In the past they have suggested opportunities for mental health and access and were given a firm 'no' as resources were not available. From the community transport point of view there has been no consultation. Jenny said the review of guided walks has not yet started yet and their aim is that 90% of guided walks must start from points available by public transport. They currently do a lot of work with constituent health authorities – eg Oldham HA and High Peak Borough Council provide health walks and we are trying to make them all encompassing – we have to provide a range, eg walks for wheelchairs and pushchairs.

Edwina is concerned about financial constraints restricting people's access to walks. The Chair felt this illustrated the wider issue of National Park members not being aware of recreation, leisure and communities in the park. He is to meet Richard Campen at some stage and will bring the point into the conversation - the review is obviously well intentioned but is weakened by excluding some of the most important partners who could add their expertise. He thanked Jenny for attending and said we all appreciated Jenny's time.

6. Report on Mountain Bike Seminar

Mike Rhodes started by giving some background information - mountain biking is an increasingly popular activity in the National Park and indeed the National Park Management Plan states that mountain biking will be enabled and promoted in the NP. The Peak District is thought by the biking fraternity to be one of the best places in Britain to bring bikes. The National Park is seeking to develop this policy and hosted the seminar at Losehill Hall in April on ways to develop the activity and improve management of it. Mike had circulated information on the mountain biking seminar and gave a presentation.

The Forestry Commission have trail centres built and developed. Is there a suitable location in the National Park for a trail centre? We already have cycle hire centres which may be an option.

Discussions focussed on four main points;

- 1) To work in partnership and improve communication and information about the sport – perhaps by the development of a web-based Forum
- 2) To look at options for the provision of purpose-built trails and a trail centre
- 3) Ideas for the improvement of routes, surfacing, new bridleway links etc
- 4) Improving links to urban areas - including improvements to public transport and overcoming capacity issues

Better communication was needed – a suggestion was made that a web-based mountain bike forum would be useful for sharing information on good routes etc. Links to urban areas should be improved. Better waymarking and cycle only routes would be good, along with action against illegal motor vehicles. The NPA response to the Derbyshire RoWIP agreed that the bridleway network was fragmented and under increasing pressure. Unsustainable pressure on existing bridleways leads to either deliberate or unintentional trespass.

Views are now sought from the Forum on the outcomes of the seminar as it is a key part of developing strategy – this LAF needs to feedback either personally or via e-mail.

ACTION: ALL

The Chair understood that it had been a useful and productive day, Mike Innerdale was there. It raises a whole number of interesting questions – and he encourages individual feedback. Terry said that the RoWIP must address the need for more bridleways – he fully supports that but is concerned about any suggestion that any routes should be for cyclists only. Sheffield are developing cycleways – but use of that terms indicates specific use – they should also be for use by horse riders and pedestrians too. Derbyshire have called them greenways. Terry feels there are concerns with areas specifically designated for cycling – for example the Wharnccliffe area has deteriorated – families have to watch out for speeding bikes in that area. A group of cyclists wanted to create circular routes on Blackamoor.

The Chair noted that purpose built routes have been enormously successful but it is all about siting and the impact on the wider area – it is not just the bikes but also car parking/access (eg the impact on wildlife). There is no easy answer but it is a growing recreational group and demand in the Peak District will increase.

Bob Berzins told the forum that he had spoken to some who had attended the seminar – feedback from others is that wildlife concerns can be a bit of a red herring. It is obvious when bikers have been across wet ground they create huge trenches and make more impact than people walking/running. The Chair felt, when thinking about the

whole Peak District, some areas are badly served by bridleways. Dick Peart said that he was aware of purpose built mountain bike areas in Scotland but as far as access to those areas are concerned, access is lacking here. He struggled to think of a suitable area for a purpose built facility in the Peak District and he felt that the focus should be on improving existing resources rather than providing new. There could easily be confusion about cyclist-only routes he believed it would be preferable to have shared routes with a separate zone for cyclists – rather than replace paths and make selective.

Edwina informed the meeting that CTC have successfully waymarked some routes around the peak district. She gave a young person's perspective of being frustrated by not having easily recognisable routes. She also felt that more routes using existing paths would be better than specifically making more. Henry said we must recognise that this is a growing sport and any problems will be made worse if something isn't done about taking the issue forward. There is a particular attraction about using unsurfaced areas which needs to be factored in. The LAF should be involved.

Job Clennell stated that existing dedicated trails seem to be in areas where there isn't urban access – ie there is more space available. The Peak District in particular is packed with every conceivable activity which all impact on one another. One pleasure about mountain biking is that you don't want or need a track – it is a challenge to ride across rough ground but this conflicts with delicate moorland. There is probably an area where some activities are not available – but people have to accept that it is not a right to do certain activities, and will have to adapt to what is available.

The Chair summed up by saying that the seminar had engaged well with the audience and was a very important step forward.

7. Discretionary restrictions under CROW Act

Bob Berzins spoke on the relationship between recreation and grouse moor management, specifically where a moorland owner near Ladybower had closed land for 28 days. Mike advised that he was entitled to do so under the CROW Act and he knew the area of heather moorland near Moscar, Bamford and the Strines. Bob told the meeting that over the last year he has wanted to engage with user groups such as the dark peak fell runners who had previously been accused about damage caused during unauthorised events. There had been a meeting between Richard Pollitt of Natural England, the fell runners and landowners. The end result was that runners are allowed under the CROW Act and they agreed to vary routes and meeting venues and keep numbers low. They subsequently met with gamekeepers and Richard Pollitt again. The main concern was to take a look at their running programme and fit in races with the concerns of landowners. One area is just coming to end of a 28 day closure this closure did not go down well with club runners, because it came out of the blue and their programme was therefore disrupted. Bob would like to promote cooperation between fell runners and land owners.

Bob had carried out some investigation and finding details of closures was difficult – there was no link from the Peak District website. He found that you need an amount of prior knowledge to find restrictions and it was difficult. He has now informed fellow club runners – their website now has a link to the Government website with lists of closures. In fact there are not many access points to this land anyway. Under the CROW Act different kinds of restrictions apply in May June July and August and throughout the 28 day period of closure. He felt the situation is confused and would like to hear what other members of the forum feel.

The Chair thought that it was a good thing that runners have engaged in dialogue and are going about it the right way. There is a legal process regarding restrictions and if

that process is followed we, as a Local Access Forum, can do nothing about it. He would be reluctant for the LAF to make any pronouncement as we have heard only one side of the story and we cannot point any fingers until the landowners in question can respond – we do not have judicial function and can only give advice to Derbyshire County Council and the National Park Authority.

Mike confirmed that the landowner did indeed follow procedures – they are required to give 5 days notice for 28 days closure and do not have to give a reason for doing so. Other feedback is that others have been asked to leave that particular area of moorland. The National Park has tried to engage landowners and understand the perspective of user groups and understand rights of way and sees restrictions as a last resort. However, it is not always possible to be constructive. Mike noted that information about restrictions needs to be improved – the National Park pays an annual subscription for this information to be provided and the website could definitely be better - the NP link could be improved too.

Terry felt that clarification was needed on 28 day closures – a number of notices went up that were advisory (nesting season) and people were asked to keep to paths/ footpaths. Mike confirmed that this area has been closed in May and 2 weeks into June – formal notices had been posted on access points to that effect. There is a dog restriction on that particular moor. The landowner has been upset by the dog ban being ignored – this is a localised problem and the NP is seeking to work with the landowner to improve that situation. Henry commented that information is critical - there will be more problems if people travel to area with an expectation to do something. The BMC do try to put information into all climbing shops, climbing walls in Sheffield as well as on the websites to make people aware. Some people don't know this information and some choose to ignore. This particular one was difficult to communicate in that it spanned a bank holiday and was over two months. The BMC have on-going problems with dog owners and it is an increasingly difficult and serious issue. Stuart Elliott asked the forum to remember you are only hearing one side of the story – the only good thing from discussion is better communication and closure notices on the web. The law is working with the landowner – it is written into the Act. Landowners have had to swallow bitter pills – and the landowner in question is within his rights. The Chair said that improving channels of communication was a good reason to bring this issue to the table. It was down to Officers to check that restrictions are legal – we have to live with it.

Dick Peart asked for clarification that for a closure of 28 days per year no reason needs to be given. Mike confirmed this and said that it was unusual for restrictions to take place in general and certainly so in a high profile area.

Bob confirmed he was not looking for a pronouncement – he was just expressing concerns as a recreational user and illustrate how, even with the best will in the world, cooperation is difficult. The most important issue is that this is the first time it has happened and it feels very significant. Bob is still finding out about what this forum can do and the intention was to stimulate a debate – from what has been said it has been useful and he hopes that this debate is not stifled. The Chair said that the meeting with the landowner and Natural England was a positive step. He highlighted the Stanage Forum as a good example of the engagement process and which raises the LAF profile in local issues and their understanding. He thanked Bob for bringing this issue to the meeting.

8. PDNPA Motor Vehicle update

Richard Pett gave the LAF a brief update – NP members held a seminar on 13 April and there was a lively debate. The policy has now been re-drafted and will be going back to members in July. If approved, then Parish Councils, user groups and the LAF will be consulted. A secondary report will then be produced. The website will allow opinions to be voiced. DCC have been provided with survey findings by the ranger service. It is envisaged that a sub group of this LAF will discuss each route on a case by case basis to make recommendations back to DCC on what to do next. The Chair asked for a show of hands for expressions of interest to develop that work - the Chair, James, Terry, Henry, Charlotte and Dick were all interested in being on the sub group and the Chair imagined that Richard Marshall would want to be involved too. There will be an option to merge with DADLAF. The Chair said this will involve going out to inspect routes and Richard Pett said there are approximately 60 sites, with some 15 routes being more urgent than others. Work will concentrate on these initially. Richard confirmed that an action plan has been produced for the Moss Road bridleway on Totley Moor and he anticipates that more of these will be produced. The Ramblers have produced information and Richard thanked them. Richard confirmed that any illegal use brought to his attention will be monitored and reported to the Police. It is useful to have information, communication is on-going with DCC and Derbyshire Constabulary. He reported success at Taddington where bikers have been deterred after notices were erected.

Terry mentioned byways and the SSSI at Houndkirk Road – people are driving onto open moorland – it is a criminal act but only if they know it is a SSSI. He feels that signage is needed to advise people of the situation. Jon Clennell spoke of a SSSI at Bretton Clough near Abney – again there are no signs and although they tell people verbally Jon feels this approach is too casual.

9. Defra consultation on the 'right to apply'

Mike had circulated a briefing note. The consultation document was large and Mike gave background information. There is a clause in CroW Act that introduces the right to apply for a public path order to divert or extinguish a right of way in relation to schools and land used for agriculture, forestry or breeding/ keeping of horses, with an associated right of appeal to the Secretary of State.

Terence Cavanagh clarified that there was not an existing right to apply for orders under the Highways Act. Authorities currently have discretionary powers but not a duty to promote these orders. So this document is about setting the right to apply in a legislative framework. There are implications on the NPA's resources. The Chair said we are looking for LAF members to sit and discuss this consultation with Mike Rhodes. Henry was concerned in principle about anything which puts pressure on National Park resources at a time when the budget has been cut. Henry, Stuart, Andrew Critchlow (in his absence) Terry and Jon Clennell were interested. Anyone else interested should contact Mike. Mike will get back to volunteers with a date for the sub group meeting.

ACTION: ALL

10. DCC Report on draft ROWIP Consultation

Gill Millward updated the meeting and had circulated a report that summarises the results of the consultation. 1,040 responses were received, 945 completed questionnaires and 95 e-mails and letters. They have now gone through all the responses and there is good support for the plan. The questionnaire showed that of the three key themes, conservation, health and sustainable travel were important to

everybody – people generally placed less importance on tourism referring to congestion and its negative impacts. There is a need to take that on board when the final plan is written up. The questionnaire asked respondents to prioritise the proposed actions which they felt to be most important; dealing with illegal use and inappropriate use by vehicles came out on top and this needs to be taken forward in a positive way. People want the existing network sorting out and also to look at creating circular routes and more bridleways, along with getting the definitive map up to date as soon as possible. The least priority was working with Parish Councils – however DCC see that as quite important, perhaps people are not always aware of the contribution they can make. Attached to the report is the Natural England response – the Chair said this was interesting. DCC want to be transparent about the responses and the report circulated at the meeting sets out every single response we have received. (They have all been acknowledged and will be published on the website in due course). We have kept individual's responses anonymous but groups are identified. There is a summary of comments and our response to what people have said. This is an initial document and will change as we work on amending the final plan. If you spot any inaccuracies please tell Gill.

ACTION: ALL

Gill said they are on target to present the RoWIP to Committee in September/ October and the final document should be in place by November 2007.

11. ROWIP updates from other authorities

Terence Cavanagh gave an update on the Oldham draft RoWIP which is now out for consultation. Members have a copy of his letter of 12 June outlining the situation Oldham has reached on the draft plan and how to respond. Terence intends to produce a questionnaire and Mike will circulate a copy with the minutes of this meeting.

ACTION: MR AND TC

A copy of the draft plan itself had been circulated. Terence thanked Gill and Mike for their support and encouragement over the past 6 months. Members were asked to take the document away and make their views known.

ACTION: ALL

Terence has taken on board the transparent way that DCC has proceeded – it is a very good model which they will follow.

12. Feedback from members

Members

Terry read out an extract from Walk Magazine. There is a growing cynical acceptance towards closures – are closures taken seriously? There are increasing numbers of people at times of high fire risk which causes contradictions – eg controlled fires getting out of hand, landowners drive onto moorland with vehicles. Footpaths remain open when evidence suggests most fires emanate from Rights of Way. Positive action is needed across all moorland areas – America and Europe provide signage to inform everybody what is going on. They also provide notices on all access points – whether formal or informal – closures should apply to everyone including landowners so consistency is seen. It is felt that the patrol of perimeters by owners and rangers etc is okay and members of the public should be encouraged to be fire watchers. These points need addressing.

Terry also spoke on the Kent CC RoWIP in particular about correspondence between the Minister concerned and LAF in Kent. Barry Gardiner wrote to every LAF and said there is no money for implementing RoWIPs – Terry said this was never intended as they are aspirational. Kent LAF has responded and is asking for more public financing. Sheffield has responded in support of that and he thinks we should support Kent in the request for further funding. There is still a need for local lobbying. They had attended a full council meeting with a petition and asked for more money for implementing the RoWIP

for Sheffield and asked the council to think laterally and imaginatively. The Council have invited the LAF to pursue funding opportunities suggested. The Chair said he has written to neighbouring constituent authorities on this point. We need to keep lobbying but does not seem to be achieving much – it doesn't mean we shouldn't carry on. Terry's points about fire restrictions are noted and we will come back to these again. Stuart Elliott spoke regarding fire closures and asked who pays the bill for when a fire is out of control. Mike responded that it was the Fire Service or the landowner. Stuart felt that any landowner will not jeopardise their own land by setting fire to it. The CroW Act is there to protect the landowner. Terry felt a proper message needs to go out.

Henry reported on the Backdale Inquiry - the inspector's decision announced the appeal was successful on ground F and failed on grounds B and C and the activity at Backdale was deemed to be illegal. There is great significance for this and other National Parks in respect of mineral planning permissions which have found a loophole in the 1995 Environment Act. The Appellants have sought leave to the High Court to appeal the decision. We await with baited breath the outcome of the appeal. He also gave details of the celebrations of the 75th Mass Trespass at Kinder which was a successful event attended by David Milliband, Barry Gardiner, Tony Hams, Lord Hattersley, Jim Perry and Sir Martin Doughty amongst others. It was a well attended and positive event. It was ironic that a walkers trespass trail established at that event has now run into access difficulties! It was a high profile event and unusual to get 2 Government ministers together and felt it was unfortunate that Barry Gardiner will almost certainly be moving on - we have built up a good relationship in this National Park.

Jon Clennell said that Mike had forwarded an e-mail from a student of Sheffield University – Jon felt he was barking up wrong tree – several people agreed and he had been sent a response.

Chair

A628 Public Inquiry – he has written on behalf of the LAF, outlining objections. He understands this has been logged and will be included when the Inquiry takes place – it starts 26 June.

The Chair reminded members to send the questionnaire back when the minutes are circulated.

13. Any other business

Gill told the meeting that the new Cycle Derbyshire leaflet was now available. They hope to produce a similar leaflet for horse riding, greenways and eventually driving. Gill had brought copies along and will send some more out if needed.

The Chair said that the Annual Report has been circulated but please help yourself to more if you would like any.

Defra consultation on Access to English coast – not especially relevant to Peak District, however one member is interested Please feedback to the coast consultation at Defra.

Training. Jane Beech (Natural England) is organising Rights of Way training for LAF members on 1, 2 or 15 October. Chair said it was important and welcomed – the venue not known at present but open to offers of free accommodation! Gill and Richard will look into this.

ACTION: GM and RB

The Chair asked for expressions of interest – 7 or 8 members would be interested in attending.

Keith Pennyfather asked what other events are being looked at for training? Mike said there had not been any progress so far but this will be discussed very soon.

The Chair advised that previously Edwina had suggested an induction pack for new members – this too is in the pipeline.

Charlotte and Edwina are pleased to attend meetings and asked that if they can be held in Bakewell occasionally it would certainly help them. This was noted by Mike Rhodes. Dick Peart told the meeting that the BMC are running an open day at the Roaches on Saturday 16 June. Henry gave brief details.

14. Dates of Next meetings:

Saturday 22 September
Thursday 6 December

The meeting closed at 1 pm