

Introduction

1. This discussion paper reviews the position on Water Recreation, Woodland, Camping and Countryside Code Topics in the area of the Peak District LAF following their recent inclusion in a new national "Right to Roam Campaign" seeking more access for all. I have also added Mountain Biking as a hot topic this summer.

2. Our approach on these issues is to advise and as part of our consideration of campaigns for greater access, I think we need to take care on how far we go on a scale between campaigning and advising. We are not a lobbying Group - we are a Forum for Discussion on Access which is to advise the Peak District NPA and Derbyshire CC in our area of the National Park and North West Derbyshire.

3. My paper is for discussion with LAF colleagues to seek views and provoke debate with relevant background policies and previous LAF presentations in Annex A. I very much appreciate the input from a number of colleagues with particular knowledge and interests I asked for comments before revising for all LAF members to consider and have included key points in the report .

4. This is a big topic at the heart of our interest and business and responses to suggested actions and our approach are important please to see if there is a consensus on our approach to key points and then follow up from today.

5. My suggested actions are in bold italics in the report. I have extracted Key points and Questions in this note with questions in blue which can be dealt with on a show of hands at the online meeting, or by email responses in advance where possible to me please, including if you cannot attend. An Access Sub Group would be useful to look at some detailed issues. The Countryside Code will be discussed with Peak District Proud under item 5.

6. Recommendation - that the report on Access issues in the Peak District related to the Right to Roam Campaign be received and points from discussion at this meeting, responses to questions below and initial consultation feedback, be considered by the Access Sub Group for a report back to our 3rd December, 2020 LAF meeting with presentations included in a suitable format

Right to Roam Campaign

The LAF's role is one of the few places that different views can be shared and stakeholders can understand each other and find areas of common ground. While we must always champion access, it would be to our detriment to lose the trust and support of landowners who may have legitimate concerns. We should consider further in the light of today's meeting and presentations by key people promoting and against Right to Roam through a meeting of the Access Sub Group with a report back to the full LAF in December.

Qn 1. I suggest at this stage the LAF should note the Campaign, consider aspects of it in practical terms for the Peak District, and listen to all points of view before we take an official stance on the subject with the benefit of appropriate consultation and presentations from promoters on behalf of Right to Roam to an Access Sub Group which would be open to any LAF member to attend and contribute to.

Do you agree? Yes/No?

Issues Particularly Relevant to the Peak District

Qn 2. I suggest we should review the report after today's discussion and questions, sound out the Peak District NPA and Derbyshire CC, and then some key consultees (para 44), followed by an Access Sub Group to advise the sponsoring authorities and seek their support for recommended policy issues and practical actions?

Do you Agree Yes/No?

We have previously been concerned about the postponed open country mapping review - now 2025 at the earliest (para 11 of my report)

Qn. 3 Should we, via the Peak District NPA and Derbyshire CC, send suggestions about the mapping review and press Natural England on this?

Do you Agree Yes/No?

Qn.4. Good practice on dedication and safeguarding of public access to woodland could be encouraged to be pursued more widely

Do you agree Yes/No?

The report refers to specific issues raised on Access like Holling Dale Plantation (para 11), and to Woodland issues re Chatsworth, Sheffield and Upper Derwent (para 30) and regarding Yarncliffe Quarry and Upperwood Quarry (paras 39 & 40)

Qn 5. I suggest detailed access matters on these specific Open Country Access Issues and Access to Woodland be pursued through the Access Sub Group?

Do you Agree Yes/No?

Qn.6. Can we encourage my suggested initial approach on Water Recreation (para 24 onwards) to see if there is scope for Agreements to be reached as Pilots to allow use for Canoeing and/or Swimming with appropriate Codes of Conduct and Education and suggest this might benefit from the forthcoming "Green Growth Fund" as a Project?

*Do you Agree for Canoeing - Yes/No? for Swimming - Yes/No?
OR is legislation the only way forward? - Do you Agree - Yes/No?*

On access to Reservoirs, there are good partnership arrangements and much positive action with the three Water Companies which should be encouraged and points of current concern should be drawn to their attention asking if improvements are possible. *There is a need to address the issue for land and water owners of liability for wild swimming accidents or injuries.*

Qn.7. Could we look at how the British Mountaineering Council has approached this with other access issues regarding public liability (especially in quarries) through Louise Hawson setting up a meeting with Water Companies. Peak District Officers and some LAF members ?

Answer - Yes/No

On Wild Camping (para 32) is not formally provided in in the Peak District. Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, permission from the landowner/tenant must be obtained before camping I gather from Louise that approaches differ in Dartmoor, the Lake District, Wales and Scotland? Fly Camping in the Peak is growing

Qn.8. Should the Wild Camping Policy be agreed or reviewed through the Access Sub Group?

Do you Agree - Yes/No?

Qn.9. On Mountain Biking (para 37) - can we agree referring to the LAF's position, that it is supportive of the managed extension of opportunities for mountain - biking and the initiatives to promote responsible biking in the Peak and better awareness of other users and the environment?

Do you Agree - Yes/No?

The Countryside Code (maybe covered by discussion of the previous item at the LAF this morning

Qn.10. On the Countryside Code (para 36) - Is there anything else to add after Covid experiences of visitors in the Peak? Should we ask that the Peak District Proud Campaign is reviewed in the light of experience and against objectives set?

Do you Agree - Yes/No?

Name of LAF member