

## Peak District Local Access Forum

**On: Thursday 9 September 2021**

**At: Webex - Virtual Meeting**

### Agenda

Start: 10.00 am

- 1 Welcome & Apologies
- 2 Membership Issues **Mike Rhodes**
- 3 Minutes from the last meeting, 10 June 2021 **John Thompson,  
Mike Rhodes**
- 4 Matters Arising from the Minutes **John Thompson**  
**Correspondence from DEFRA and PDNPA on the Landscapes Review  
Monsal Trail Update**
- 5 Derbyshire CC RoWIP Update **Gill Millward**
- 6 Access Update on Right to Roam Issues **Bob Berzins**  
**BREAK**
- 7 Member's Reports **Bob Berzins,  
Martin Bennett**
- 8 Any Other Business  
**NPA Car Parks Review  
Hope Valley Climate Change Action Project**
- 9 Date and venue of next meeting - 9th December 2021

Close: 12.00 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

# Peak District Local Access Forum

## Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 10 June 2021 Virtual Webex Meeting run from Aldern House, Board Room.

### Members Present:

Martin Bennett  
Bob Berzins  
Richard Entwistle  
Clare Griffin  
Louise Hawson  
Geoff Nickolds  
Ally Turner

John Thompson (Chair)

Ben Seal  
Edwina Edwards  
Charlotte Gilbert  
Alastair Harvey  
Jez Kenyon  
Paul Richardson  
Joe Dalton

### Others Present:

Mike Rhodes, (PDNPA) (Secretary)  
Gill Millward, (DCC)  
Karen Harrison, (PDNPA)

Rich Pett, (PDNPA)  
Sue Smith, (PDNPA)

## 76. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Due to John Thompson (Chair) having connection issues at the start of the meeting, Bob Berzins (Vice Chair) welcomed everyone to the fourth virtual meeting of the Peak District Local Access Forum and thanked the Democratic and Legal Support Team for their support, with Karen kindly doing the minutes this time.

Apologies for absence had been received from Ian Huddlestone, Jon Stewart and Steve Martin as members and Sarah Wilks (PDNPA Officer) with her thanks and best wishes to Edwina via the Chair.

## 77. MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Bob Berzins, on behalf of the Peak District Local Access Forum thanked Roly Smith and Andrew Murley who had both stood down, for their contributions to the work of the LAF. Members were advised that this would also be Edwina Edwards last meeting.

## 78. MINUTES FROM THE LAST MEETING, 11 MARCH 2021

The minutes of the last meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2021 were approved as a correct record with thanks to Belinda Wybrow for producing them.

## 79. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mike Rhodes gave an update on the Peak District Generation Green - Connecting Young People with Nature Project.

### Nationally

See <https://www.yha.org.uk/generationgreen>

Funded by the government's Green Recovery Challenge Fund.

10 National Parks involved, with Youth Hostels Association, Scouts/Guides/Outward Bound/Field Studies Council.

12 Posts created in National Parks (Lorna Fisher, Harriet Saltis).

**Peak District Generation Green main updates:**

- **Youth Engagement Volunteer Ranger** roles created and recruited. Starting in June to act as Green Champions – assisting with youth programmes across the Engagement Team. E.g. Schools sessions, residential stays, Junior Rangers etc.
- **Green Action Residential stays at Youth Hostels across the Peak District, August – November.** Looking for schools (primary and secondary) and youth groups to take part, ages 8-21. These will focus on connecting young people to nature and promoting pro environmental behaviours through exploration, mindfulness and practical conservation. Opportunity to gain the John Muir Award.
- **Green Career Skills, Monthly Volunteering August -March for ages 18-26.** To aid Young people on their journey to becoming Green Leaders. Working with professionals in the field and having a go at various 'Green' roles including Rangers, Ecologists, Cultural Heritage, Outdoor Pursuits, Comms & Marketing. If anyone is interested in showcasing their role to engage young people in a Green career pathway, please contact us. As part of these monthly volunteering days there will be opportunity to take part in weekend residential stays August, Sept & Oct.
- **Junior Rangers 16+ (similar to above, quarterly sessions).**
- **Please pass on updates to groups or individuals who may be interested in taking part and signpost to our website or email [GenerationGreen@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:GenerationGreen@peakdistrict.gov.uk)**

**MONSAL TRAIL**

John Thompson, on behalf of the LAF, had been in touch with Sarah Dines MP and Robert Largan MP regarding the possibility of re-opening the Monsal Trail as a railway. A letter had been received from Sarah Dines, which had been circulated to LAF Members which Mike Rhodes went on to summarise. It was noted that in her view there was no overwhelming support at present to re-open the line, due to the Monsal Trail being a tremendous asset, and that alternative solutions needed to be looked at in conjunction with Local and National Governments.

Gill Millward was asked as to whether an Impact Viability Study had been done since the one done in the 1990's? Gill reported that she would check and report back to LAF Members.

Thanks were given to John Thompson for keeping the Monsal Trail's importance as a recreational route in the UK on the agenda of MP's.

**80. ACCESS UPDATE ON RIGHT TO ROAM ISSUES**

Bob Berzins gave an update and reported that discussions on right to roam issues were ongoing.

Three main areas had been identified:-

- Paddle Sports
- Wild Swimming
- Mountain Biking

Paul Richardson reported that access issues for mountain biking were ongoing with only a

limited number of bridleways being available – 11% in the Peak District National Park compared to 22% nationally, and that users were wanting more adventurous challenging routes which could impact on other user groups. Project 22 had identified routes that would be suitable for upgrading in Biggin Dale, Abney Clough and Bradwell Moor, and would be looking to the LAF for support to get them upgraded. Paul also reported that following a meeting with Severn Trent Water, a permissive path in the Ladybower area had been opened and they were looking at identifying other routes as well. He would also be attending a meeting with the National Trust regarding the same issues.

It was noted that landowners needed to be engaged as it was a sensitive issue for some due to behavioural issues of some mountain bike riders, and concern over the wildlife disturbance.

The LAF congratulated the work that had been done with Severn Trent Water and hoped that horse riders would be included in any upgrading of rights of way as horse riders also lacked amenities.

**John Thompson joined the meeting and thanked Bob for chairing thus far.**

## **81. PRESENTATION - WILD SWIMMING**

John Thompson welcomed Suzie Wheway to the meeting and invited her to give a presentation to the Members regarding wild swimming in the Peak District National Park and nationally.

Suzie reported that access to wild swimming in Scotland was much better as you could swim in reservoirs there which you couldn't do here, and that access to the water within the Peak District National Park was not good. It was estimated that in 2019, 2.1 million people swam in open waters, and that during the last year, due to the COVID pandemic this had increased three-fold due to the swimming pools being closed so wild swimming was now more fashionable not just a specialised sport and it also had lots of health benefits.

A discussion followed the presentation – Members of the LAF expressed concern about recent deaths in reservoirs and recognised the concerns of the water companies.

Members of the LAF thanked Suzie for her presentation. It was accepted that there were bodies of water that were not suitable for use due to accountability if something happened, but would like to see a pragmatic approach to finding a middle ground where it was acceptable to go.

John Thompson thanked Suzie for her presentation and asked that the Access Sub Group look at the issues informally.

## **82. GREEN LANES SUB GROUP REPORT**

Sue Smith introduced the item and gave a brief update following the sub-group meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> April.

LAF Members were happy to support the amended terms of reference which would reflect the groups composition and the notes from 29th April.

## **83. PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK PROPERTY DISPOSALS**

Louise Hawson gave some background information to Forum Members regarding PDNPA property disposals. A letter was submitted to Adrian Barraclough back in 2019 requesting a full list of future property disposals so that the LAF could give its thoughts to the National

Park Authority.

The LAF then wrote to Emma Stone in March 2021 for an update on the review process and was issued with a “Toolkit” which explained the process of disposal. However, Forum Members would like to see more external consultation at an earlier stage in the process. A set of questions was issued to Emma Stone to consider in advance of the meeting.

The purpose of asking the questions was:-

- to encourage access issues (beyond formal access) to be considered earlier in the process, through consultation with the LAF
- to encourage good practice in engagement and consultation in general
- to ensure the process enables more creative/community ownership models to be actively considered.

John Thompson welcomed Emma Stone to the meeting, who then gave her responses to the four questions, as shown in quotation marks below:-

**1. Could you explain how properties are assessed against the Overarching Principles to identify those for potential disposal, particularly with respect to issues around access and amenity? Do you use a checklist/scoring system, or is it more subjective?**

“The decision will always be subjective to some degree due to the diversity of the property portfolio.

The Toolkit and Asset Disposal Procedure (ADP) give sufficient detail as to the assessment of properties as being surplus – see 4.1 of the ADP (things like whether the property fits with strategic outcomes/there’s an operational need to keep it, etc). 4.1 sets out the considerations for determining whether a property is surplus. The Toolkit provides that the initial decision is made by the sponsoring Head of Service, taking into account the considerations set out in 4.1 of the ADP (Stage 1), and then consults on the proposal for a corporate decision to be made (Stage 2)”.

**2. Alternative ownership models - such as community ownership - often require more time and organisation to develop than standard commercial tenders. Given this, it would be useful to identify sites where this might be an option early in the disposal process, for example if there is already an expressed interest and/or if this might best serve achievement of the overarching principles. This would mean that time (and possibly support) can be given to local communities to develop such options. Is it possible to integrate this, by including provision for consideration of community or other models at Stage 2 of the toolkit?**

“The Toolkit first mentions consideration of alternatives to open market sale at Stage 4, however in practice this would logically occur during the earlier internal consultation stage at Stage 2 in the context of how the property would be protected if a decision is made to dispose. This would form part of the Head of Service’s proposal in the ‘provisionally surplus report’ so that internal consultees would be aware of the potential purchaser when considering what protections would be needed for the property (covenants or designations). If an acceptable alternative ownership model were to be proposed (eg community ownership) then appropriate timescales would be agreed with the purchaser. This is happening currently with regard to a site near Foolow where an extension to timescales has been agreed to enable the community to investigate fundraising opportunities”.

**3. External consultation is provided for in Stage 9 of the toolkit, once the list of properties for disposal, and the options for disposal, have been identified. This is of course a critical stage for general public consultation. It is suggested that external stakeholder views should be integrated at Stage 2, as you gather input from the various Heads of Service. As well as identifying properties where alternative ownership models may be an option, external feedback at this stage can help identify controversial sites, or issues that may arise later in the process, such as around informal access, or possible connectivity opportunities with neighbouring Right of Way. Is this something that could be integrated, for example making provision for Heads of Service to consult with external parties at this early stage? The LAF could be a useful sounding board here.**

“I don’t think there is anything to be gained by utilising our own and stakeholder resources to consult externally when we are not sure that a property is considered surplus. It is more logical and efficient for the Authority to decide whether it considers a property to be surplus before consulting externally. The Access and RoW team would be consulted at Stage 2, via their Head of Service, and should identify any public access issues.

Once a provisional decision is made that an asset is surplus, then the issue of whether to dispose and the method of disposal and constraints to be imposed need to be consulted on and decided (Stages 2 onwards). So we would only consult externally once the property is considered surplus (after Stage 2). In practice it is likely that processes will run in parallel and external consultation will happen between Stages 2 and 9 rather than at the end of the process”.

**4. Stage 9 refers to the Head of Marketing and Communication supporting the consultation process. Given the expertise in community consultation that exists within the Community Policy team, would it be useful to also include them in this process, in particular where disposals may be controversial or complex locally? The guidance on consultation here is quite vague, and that team has guidance and principles that could be adapted and integrated here to create a simple but meaningful guide.**

“We will utilise the resources we have in the most appropriate way for the situation. It is not anticipated that we would be holding face to face consultation events in relation to property disposals. We will develop a generic communications plan for potential property disposals as part of the development of our disposal strategy”.

Emma Stone informed the LAF Members that an Active Property Disposal Plan should be published later this year and that she would try and let LAF Members know in advance of the paper being presented to Authority Members.

John Thompson thanked both Louise Hawson and Emma Stone for their presentations, information and responses to questions.

## **84. DERBYSHIRE CC ROWIP UPDATE**

Gill Millward from Derbyshire County Council presented her report and asked that if any Member had any questions, then to please email her. The Chair thanked Gill for her comprehensive and well illustrated report.

**The report was welcomed and noted.**

## **85. MEMBERS' REPORTS**

Bob Berzins will be attending the National Park Management Plan meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> July for John Thompson, so can all Members please complete the questionnaire if they hadn't already done so.

Charlotte Gilbert reported that the date for the next Trails Steering Group was still to be arranged by Emma Stone.

## **86. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chair reported that this was Edwina Edwards' last meeting as a Member of the Local Access Forum as she was standing down. Edwina joined the LAF in September 2006 and became its Chair from 2010-2017. Members of the LAF gave their personal thanks to Edwina and a statement from Andrew McCloy, former Chair of the LAF, was read out.

Sue Smith reported that Members had contributed to the Access Fund for improvements in the Lathkill area and that an update would be sent around to Members in due course.

Edwina was invited to say a few words in which she thanked both the LAF and Officers for their commitment and knowledge and promised that she would keep in touch.

## **87. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS - 9TH SEPTEMBER AND 9TH DECEMBER 2021**

The date of the next meeting will be Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> September and it was hoped that this could be back at Aldern House, but more details on this would be known nearer the time.

**The meeting finished at 12.35pm.**



**Harrison Karen**

---

**From:** John Thompson <johnthom86015@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 26 August 2021 11:52  
**To:** Rhodes Mike  
**Cc:** Smith Sue; Bobberzins; Charlotte Bright  
**Subject:** FW: Landscapes Review

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Authority's email system.  
Use caution when opening. If in doubt, do not open attachments or any links contained in the  
message.**

Hi Mike

Please attach this to the response Sarah Fowler gave me (follows next) as a Matter  
Arising to go with the LAF Agenda for 9<sup>th</sup> September

Kind regards

John

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

---

**From:** [Saunders, Jade](#)  
**Sent:** 25 August 2021 14:39  
**To:** [johnthom86015@gmail.com](mailto:johnthom86015@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Mike.Rhodes@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:Mike.Rhodes@peakdistrict.gov.uk); [Inman, Amber](#)  
**Subject:** Landscapes Review

Hi John,

Thank you for getting in touch with us regarding the Government's response to the Landscapes review. The government is committed to ensuring our protected landscapes flourish as havens for nature and are places that everyone can visit and enjoy. On 24th June, the Secretary of State laid a Written Ministerial Statement on the Government's response to the Landscapes Review, setting out our support for the independent Landscapes Review's recommendations to improve nature recovery and public access, and bring the family of protected landscapes closer together.

We are continuing to work closely with partner organisations to develop our response, and have committed to consult on draft proposals this Autumn.

We share Julian Glover's vision for our protected landscapes and to achieve this vision we want to work closely with partners, including private, public and voluntary sectors, and particularly the protected landscapes family, in developing our approach to implementing the review. As such, we have been working with representatives from different National Parks and AONBs, and during the consultation period we are planning to hold workshops for partners and groups interested in Access to capture a broad range of views.

Many thanks,

Jade Saunders | Strategy, Finance and Governance | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |  
[Jade.Saunders@defra.gov.uk](mailto:Jade.Saunders@defra.gov.uk)

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within Defra systems we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Defra's computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

**Harrison Karen**

---

**From:** John Thompson <johnthom86015@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 24 August 2021 12:34  
**To:** Fowler Sarah  
**Cc:** Rhodes Mike; Crowder Ruth; Smith Sue  
**Subject:** Re: Defra Response to Landscapes Review

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Authority's email system.  
Use caution when opening. If in doubt, do not open attachments or any links contained in the  
message.**

Very helpful and much appreciated thank you Sarah

Mike - can that be included please as a Matter Arising?

Very best wishes

John

On Tue, 24 Aug 2021 at 12:30, Fowler Sarah <[Sarah.Fowler@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Fowler@peakdistrict.gov.uk)> wrote:

Hi John

My summary would be:

On 24 June 2021 the Secretary of State for Defra gave a written statement to Parliament in response to the Landscapes Review Report, which was published in September 2019. The statement is high level and sets out the importance of protected landscapes for nature's recovery, responding to the climate emergency and to enhance public access and as places where people live and work. The government intends to work with National Park Authorities, AONBs and others as it consults on fuller proposals later in the year. It also announced that Natural England is considering the designation of new AONBs (Yorkshire Wolds and Cheshire Sandstone Ridge) and extensions to the Surrey Hills and Chilterns AONB. The statement can be seen here: [Written statements - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament](#). National Parks England (who speak up for all 10 English National Parks) has responded, with a statement from Andrew McCloy (who has just taken on the role of Chair of National Park England). The response can be seen here: [Landscapes review - government response: National Parks England](#)

The announcement includes a new funding programme to support farming in protected landscapes, which will be overseen by National Park Authorities and AONB bodies and will run from mid-2021 to April 2024. The 2021-22 Budget Report presented to the Authority meeting in February indicated this funding was being considered for us. Sue Fletcher, Head of Landscape, has provided a fuller report on this Farming in Protected Landscapes (FiPL) programme for discussion and approval at the Authority meeting next week. Details of this scheme are now live on our website [here](#).

This is an important moment for us all who work in National Parks and AONBs. It recognises our role, both locally and nationally, in supporting nature, climate, people and places. Our focus will be on engaging constructively, locally and nationally, as this develops into fuller proposals for consultation, with of course an early opportunity for input from Members. We are also keen that as a network of protected landscapes we use this moment to show the way to how we can be a greener, healthier, more resilient and connected nation.

Many thanks

Sarah

Please use e-mail in the first instance to contact me as I am working from home for some days during the week.

My PA can be contacted on [belinda.wybrow@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:belinda.wybrow@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

The Peak District National Park continues to be well cared for by our passionate staff. In these unprecedented times, however, some of our public services are being impacted so do keep an eye on our website for the latest information.

**From:** John Thompson <[johnthom86015@gmail.com](mailto:johnthom86015@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** 24 August 2021 12:23

**To:** Fowler Sarah <[Sarah.Fowler@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Fowler@peakdistrict.gov.uk)>; Rhodes Mike <[Mike.Rhodes@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:Mike.Rhodes@peakdistrict.gov.uk)>; Smith Sue <[Sue.Smith@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:Sue.Smith@peakdistrict.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Fwd: Defra Response to Landscapes Review

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Authority's email system.  
Use caution when opening. If in doubt, do not open attachments or any links contained in the message.**

Hi Mike

One for Matters Arising at LAF on 9th Sept please. Anything to add please Sarah?

Best wishes

John

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **John Thompson** <[johnthom86015@gmail.com](mailto:johnthom86015@gmail.com)>

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 2021 at 08:51

Subject: Defra Response to Landscapes Review

To: <[johnthom86015@gmail.com](mailto:johnthom86015@gmail.com)>

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2021-06-24/hcws119>

Peak District National Park Authority, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, DE45 1AE. Phone:01629 816200

-----  
This email message may contain confidential information, may be legally privileged and /or contain personal views or opinions that are not the Authority's. It is intended only for the use of the addressee or those included on the email recipients. If you have received this email in error please tell us and delete it immediately. Under Freedom of Information legislation email content may be disclosed. The Authority may monitor email traffic data and also the content of email for the purposes of security. Our Privacy Notice tells you about how we will use, and store your information, in line with the GDPR. Please click [here](#) to view the notice.

No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any legally binding agreement on behalf of the Authority with another party by email without express written confirmation by the Authority's Head of Law or authorised deputy for the specific agreement.

-----  
This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by CensorNet. The service is powered by [MailSafe](#).  
For more information please visit <http://www.censornet.com>

This page is intentionally left blank

Thursday, August 5, 2021 www.matlockmercury.co.uk

MAT

# Park bosses set out case versus rail line

**Ed Dingwall**  
edward.dingwall@jfmmedia.co.uk  
@EDdingwall

The Peak District National Park Authority has issued a new response to groups proposing the restoration of a railway line from Derby to Manchester along the hugely popular Monsal Trail.

Organisations including Manchester & East Midlands Rail Action Partnership (MEMRAP) have developed proposals to reinstate the former Midland Mainline.

Rebranded as the 'Peaks and Dales Railway', the line would cross the Peak District via Matlock, Rowsley, Bakewell and Millers Dale, and MEMRAP has been campaigning to build support for the idea and tie it to the Gov-

ernment's 'levelling up' tagline. However, the plans have proved controversial, not least because the route of the



Chee Tor tunnel on was previously part of the railway route which is now

line is now used by hundreds of thousands of walkers and cyclists each year.

Last week, a spokesman for the Peak District Nation-

al Park Authority said: "The authority is totally committed to a low-carbon and sustainable future for travel and access for all to the national park.

"However, we do not accept that the reinstatement of the railway on the route of the Monsal Trail is part of the solution."

In an effort to explain its position, the authority has outlined two tests which any proposed line would have to meet in order to outweigh the significant benefits of protecting the route for leisure use, landscape character and biodiversity.

The first test is whether the line would meet identifiable strategic needs in the national interest.

This is important because of the principle of consideration of the landscape and environment.

The park spokesman said: "The authority has worked with MEMRAP to understand if their current proposal can pass these tests, however to date we have not received anything to indicate the tests can, or have, been overcome by their work."

This page is intentionally left blank



## **6. CAR PARKS REVIEW (ES)**

### **1. Purpose of the report**

To seek approval for the additional income, estimated at £256,522 including VAT (excluding VAT it is £213,768). Figures within the rest of the Report are exclusive of VAT unless stated. This is through the:

1. amendment the tariff for the Authority's pay and display car parks
2. implementation of the mechanism to regularly increase the pay and display charges
3. inclusion of additional car parks for pay and display

### **Key Issues**

- **Members approved biennial reviews of the car park tariffs. The last reviews took place in 2016 and was implemented in 2019.**
- **Additional car parks have been identified as, whilst assisting traffic management also having potential as chargeable sites.**
- **The expected gross income from the proposed changes exceeds £150,000 for the existing and additional sites annually and therefore requires approval of the Programmes and Resources Committee in accordance with the Authority's Standing Orders (Part 7.2(b) and 7.G-1).**

### **2. Recommendation(s)**

1. **That the proposed increase in charges is approved.**
2. **That the proposed mechanism to regularly increase charges is approved.**
3. **That charging is introduced to the additional proposed car parks.**

### **3. How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?**

The provision of car parking within the National Park for visitors supports the PDNPA in providing a sustainable, welcoming and inspiring place for all.

The need for visitors to access the countryside has been highlighted through the COVID-19 pandemic. The provision of public car parks helps to facilitate and manage this access. The majority of the car parks are associated with facilities and land that the Authority manages for visitors to use free of charge. This includes the multi-user trails, North Lees Estate and public toilets.

The car park infrastructure provided by the Authority and others helps to manage traffic flow within the park, reducing the incidence of verge-parking and resultant damage to roadside flora.

In addition to assisting traffic management car parks provide a sustainable source of income to offset the management costs of the Authority's assets. The recommendations contained within this report, if approved, will make a significant and planned contribution to the achievement of KPI13 within the current Corporate Strategy period.

### **4. Background**

On 4 October 2016 the Authority, through RMT, agreed several measures to improve car park management at Authority sites, this included alterations to the tariff and introduction of civil enforcement through the Derbyshire Parking Partnership.

The report seeks authorisation to amend the existing tariff, based on inflation, cost increases and benchmarking against other providers. With maintained car park usage this should offer the Authority an estimated increased income of £68,066 (exclusive of VAT).

The report seeks authorisation to increase the number of pay and display car parks operated by the Authority. Based on average income per space in 2019/20, this should offer the Authority an estimated increased income of £145,702 (exclusive of VAT).

The Authority currently operates 44 car parks of which a pay and display system operates in 18. The gross car park and permit income to the Authority in 2019/20 (exclusive of VAT) was £357,920. This has been used as the base figure for all income calculations within the proposals.

The income that the Authority receives from car park charges helps to offset the cost of providing the car parks and the sites that they service, most notably the Monsal, High Peak and Tissington Trails, North Lees Estate and the public washroom facilities..

The operation of the Authority car parks is subject to the Authority Byelaws, and within Derbyshire to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for pay and display car parks. These will require amendment to implement the revised tariff and include additional car parks within the pay and display system. The process of amending the Byelaws is expected to take between 12 and 24 months, however, this is within the control of DEFRA. Implementation of the proposed changes will commence as soon as possible following amendment of the Byelaws.

Amending the Byelaws and TRO requires public consultation, this is advertising within the car parks and the local press. Details will also be included on our website and social media. The TRO consultation process will be managed by Derbyshire County Council (DCC). Consultation in relation to the Byelaw amendments will be carried out by the Authority. This has been normal practice for previous changes.

## 5. Proposals

The proposals are to:

1. **Increase the current tariff.** Table 1 shows the current and proposed tariffs.

**TABLE 1 – Proposed Tariff Increase**

| Tariff structure               | Existing Charge (£) | Proposed Charge (£)       | Excluding VAT (£) | % Increase |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Up to 1 hr                     | 1.50                | £1.75                     | £1.46             | 17%        |
| Up to 2 hr                     | 2.50                | £2.90                     | £2.42             | 16%        |
| Up to 4hr                      | 4.00                | £4.65                     | £3.88             | 16%        |
| All day                        | 4.75                | £5.50                     | £4.58             | 16%        |
| Coaches (where permitted) 2hr  | 4.00                | Increase to 3hrs<br>£5.10 | £4.25             | n/a        |
| Horse boxes/lorries up to 2 hr | 4.00                | Increase to 4hrs<br>£5.10 | £4.25             | n/a        |
| Horse boxes/lorries all day    | 7:00                | £8.10                     | £6.75             | 16%        |
| Motorcycles all day            | 1.50                | £2.10                     | £1.75             | 40%        |
| Blue badge holders             | Free                | Free                      | Free              | 0%         |
| Cycles                         | Free                | Free                      | Free              | 0%         |
| <b>Permits</b>                 |                     |                           |                   |            |
| Visitors Permit (annual)       | 40.00               | £66.00                    | £55.00            | 65%        |
| Holiday permit (week)          | 15.00               | £17.50                    | £14.58            | 17%        |

The above tariff is a 3% per annum increase for 5 years, it has also been benchmarked against local councils and other National Parks. Over the 5 years this is effectively an average 16% increase, this would give an increase in income of £53,742.

The 3% per year is based on levels of inflation since October 2016, the annual rates have varied over this time and at present are lower. Operational costs have also increased during this time. The slightly higher than inflation increases are proposed to enable a robust tariff and income stream for the Authority, until the next tariff review.

Separate charges are proposed for different users, this is to make payments at the car park machines simpler for users. The charge differential will also allow analysis of car park users.

The coach hours have been increased to every 3 hours in line with other local councils. The horse box is altered to half (4 hours) and full days as it has been established that 2 hours is not a feasible length of time.

The annual permit has been raised to 12 days parking, in line with the Severn Trent permit. Comparison with other local authorities is not possible as their passes have much higher charges for the town centre car parks. Based on the number of permits sold in 2019/20, income would increase by £14,324.

## **2. Regularly increase the pay and display tariff**

To improve efficiency and to keep the National Park charges up to date it is proposed to link the pay and display tariff to the annual increases in the Retail Price Index (RPI). The prices will be rounded to the nearest five pence, or the smallest coin the car park machines take. The tariff should be increased on 1<sup>st</sup> April every three years, starting in 2024.

## **3. Increase the number of Authority pay and display car parks**

All of those car parks currently not part of the pay and display portfolio have been assessed for suitability for inclusion. In addition to assisting traffic management (and in particular the enforcement of parking restrictions) such car parks must be financially viable. In order to be financially viable they must be of a size and character that will sustain the investment in required infrastructure and the cost of cash collection services (where applicable).

Car Park machines require a strong mobile signal to operate card transactions. An assessment of signal strength has been carried out to inform this report and recommendations. They need to be in suitable locations for our staff to undertake maintenance and other call outs.

Table 2 identifies the car parks where the introduction of charges will be economically viable and the potential gross income that could be achieved from each site, based on the average revenue per space achieved in 2019/20. The car parks serve our Trails and North Lees Estates with a number of others in popular locations.

Additional operational costs will be incurred, similar to those of the existing car parks around payment processing, machine maintenance, enforcement and lease fees. These have been estimated, and may vary with the level of usage of the car parks and with the split between cash and card payments.

**TABLE 2 – Potential Additional Sites**

| Site Name and locality                 | Spaces     | Potential income - existing tariff (excluding VAT) | Potential income - new tariff (excl. VAT) | Estimated additional annual revenue costs | Estate budget         |
|--|------------|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| Friden (Nr Newhaven)                   | 45         | £12,701  | £14,734                                   | £2,031                                    | Trails                |
| Minninglow (Nr Pike Hall)              | 25         | £7,056   | £8,186                                    | £2,008                                    | Trails                |
| Narlows Lane (Thorpe)                  | 45         | £12,701  | £14,734                                   | £2,299                                    | Car parks and toilets |
| Thorpe Station (Thorpe)                | 45         | £12,701  | £14,734                                   | £2,299                                    | Trails                |
| Dennis Knoll (Nr Stanage Edge)         | 10         | £2,822   | £3,274                                    | £1,807                                    | North Lees            |
| Hook's Carr (Nr Stanage Edge)          | 50         | £14,113  | £16,371                                   | £2,366                                    | North Lees            |
| Upper Burbage Bridge (Nr Stanage Edge) | 25         | £7,056   | £8,186                                    | £2,737                                    | North Lees            |
| Barber Booth, (Edale)_                 | 20         | £5,645   | £6,548                                    | £1,941                                    | Car parks and toilets |
| Alstonefield                           | 25         | £7,056   | £8,186                                    | £1,408                                    | Car parks and toilets |
| Milldale (Nr Alstonefield/ Dovedale)   | 40         | £11,290  | £13,097                                   | £1,609                                    | Car parks and toilets |
| Derwent Overlook (Nr Fairholmes)       | 60         | £16,935  | £19,645                                   | £2,523                                    | Car parks and toilets |
| Blore Pastures (Ilam)                  | 55         | £15,524  | £18,008                                   | £1,832                                    | Car parks and toilets |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>445</b> | <b>£125,600</b>                                    | <b>£145,702</b>                           | <b>£24,860</b>                            |                       |

Table 3 shows the current PDNPA parking space provision allocated as chargeable and non-chargeable and the impact of the proposed changes on this provision.

**TABLE 3 – Space Analysis**

| Type of space                         | Number of spaces | % of spaces |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Currently chargeable                  | 1,053            | 58%         |
| Marked disabled bays – non-chargeable | 44               | 2%          |
| Proposed for charges                  | 445              | 25%         |
| Remaining non-chargeable              | 264              | 15%         |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>1,802</b>     |             |

In implementing the additional car parks there will be some initial set up costs including advertising, DCC Officer time associated with amending the Traffic Regulation Order (required to enable enforcement), new P&D machines and additional signage. The initial set up costs are estimated at £106,000. Income projections show that this should be recouped in the first year.

Consideration has been given to utilising the car park at Aldern House during weekends by including it within the byelaws and utilising it as a public P&D car park. The demand for this is

unknown and cannot easily be predicted therefore the financial viability of installing a P&D machine is difficult to evaluate.

It is proposed that this site is included in the byelaws as a chargeable car park and an older P&D machine (scheduled for replacement) from one of our existing sites is repurposed/refurbished and installed at Aldern House, thereby reducing the investment required. This will enable the car park to be opened to the public on a trial basis.

Introducing charging to car parks has the potential to displace users to nearby provision or on road parking, the majority of our car parks are on rural roads that has the potential to cause problems. A number of the sites already experience on road parking, or are on roads too narrow and with unsuitable verges for on road parking.

To mitigate for any additional on road parking it is proposed to undertake additional communication at the sites to highlight how parking fees are spent and the negative impact of verge parking. Previously targeted engagement and PR led to an increase of 29% in parking fees at the Hollin Bank Car Park. In addition on road parking will be surveyed prior to charges being implemented and afterwards to assess the impact, if significant change is identified then further targeted PR will be undertaken, with other actions reviewed.

### **Are there any corporate implications members should be concerned about?**

#### **6. Financial:**

There is a risk that expected increase in income may not be achieved. There are a significant number of factors that affect car park income, one of the most unpredictable is the weather as a much smaller number of visitors come during poor weather. The COVID-19 restrictions have had an impact on 2020/21 figures with charging suspended for part of the year, as well as visitor restrictions for most of the remaining year.

The addition of pay and display car parks requires significant investment, this is estimated at £106,000. To limit and manage the risk then the implementation could be phased over a number of years. Table 2 has been ordered to show the potential order for a phased implementation.

The Corporate Property Asset Management Plan 2020 highlighted a backlog of maintenance associated with the Authority's build infrastructure. Car park income is critical to fund ongoing maintenance liabilities, enabling the Authority to continue to provide the facilities that are essential to our visitors and local communities. If the recommendations are not approved/implemented in order to provide the required funds then the backlog of maintenance is likely to continue to increase. No other comparable source of additional income has been identified.

#### **7. Risk Management:**

There could be delays to the processes as the Byelaws rely on two consultation periods with DEFRA, the TRO process is to be managed through Derbyshire County Council (DCC), and as such relies on Officer time of a third party.

Charging for currently free car parks has a risk as visitors may choose not to use the car parks and use road side spaces instead. This is not a safe possibility at some locations. This is also a risk with increasing the tariff. This was highlighted as a risk during the 2016 car park review but those concerns were not borne out.

As part of the implementation of these changes a communications plan will be devised to encourage responsible behaviour and highlight the important role that car park income has in enabling the Authority to carry out its work and provide essential facilities for visitors.

It is not possible to foresee if or where problems might arise. Close monitoring of sites will be required so that mitigating measures can be implemented quickly, in partnership with the Highway Authority.

Pay and display machines in the more remote, and therefore more vulnerable, locations will be card only machines to reduce the risk of machine theft and damage.

## **8. Sustainability:**

The proposed, new pay and display machines will be solar powered, and where possible card only machines will be installed to reduce the need for regular vehicular visits for cash collection and maintenance. The new machines are all mobile enabled so ticket levels and other maintenance issues can be monitored remotely, therefore reducing and managing vehicular visits.

## **9. Equality:**

Annual and weekly permits are available that significantly reduce the cost of parking for regular users.

The charges apply between 9am and 6pm daily and this is not proposed to change. This gives the opportunity to access free of charge outside these hours.

The proposed P&D machines will be installed with consideration to those with mobility limitations.

Consideration has been given as follows to the protected characteristics described in the Equality Act 2010:

Age – no impact

Disability – There will be a small positive impact as the changes will improve flow on PDNPA car parks meaning that there is more likelihood of finding a space. Parking for blue badge holders will remain free of charge and access to disabled parking bays will be protected through the enforcement of restrictions. Some parking providers do now charge for the use of allocated accessible parking however, in order to support visits to the park by under-represented audiences, officers suggest that this approach is not adopted. Anecdotal information indicates that this provision is viewed positively by visitors.

gender reassignment – no impact

marriage and civil partnership – no impact

pregnancy and maternity – no impact

race – no impact

religion or belief – no impact

sex – no impact

sexual orientation – no impact

## **10. Climate Change**

The proposal does not directly contribute to the Authority's role in climate change or the carbon net zero targets. The machines will be managed remotely as outlined in the sustainability section.

Indirectly the car parks provide a mechanism for the Authority to engage with visitors to the National Park regarding issues associated with climate change.

**11. Background papers (not previously published)**

None

**Appendices**

Appendix 1 – car parks identified as inappropriate for introduction of charges and rationale

**Report Author, Job Title and Publication Date**

Emma Stone, Head of Asset Management, 20 April 2021  
emma.stone@peakdistrict.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



**Harrison Karen**

---

**From:** Nicholson Tim  
**Sent:** 27 August 2021 13:44  
**To:** John Thompson  
**Cc:** Rhodes Mike  
**Subject:** Hope Valley Climate Action Travelling Light Project - Roundtable Workshops

Hi John

I hope that you are well and that you have been able to make the most of the recent good weather.

I attended a meeting of the Steering Group of the Hope Valley Climate Action Travelling Light Project yesterday afternoon. The project is aimed at cutting the carbon associated with travel to, from and within the Hope Valley. The project was launched in July and there has been a project officer appointed to lead on the development of the project.

The next stage of the project is a series of roundtable discussions with appropriate stakeholders. One of the sessions is intended for Recreational Groups, and I was wondering if you might be able to help the Project Officer with identifying the appropriate contacts for this session. I was also wondering if the Local Access Forum might not be that roundtable group.

The Travelling Light Project Officer is Mandy Holden, and I'm sure that she would appreciate any assistance that you and the Local Access Forum are able to offer in relation to this roundtable session. Mandy's e-mail address is - [hopevalleytravellinglight@gmail.com](mailto:hopevalleytravellinglight@gmail.com)

Thanks for any help that you are able to provide.

I hope that you have an enjoyable Bank Holiday Weekend.

Best wishes

Tim

**Tim Nicholson**

Transport Policy Planner

01629816 281

[Tim.Nicholson@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:Tim.Nicholson@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank