

**CONSULTATION ON THE  
DRAFT SHEFFIELD MOORS MASTERPLAN 2013-2028  
PART 2 SHEFFIELD MOORS PARTNERSHIP RESPONSE**

Page 77



**Sheffield Moors**  
Partnership



**April 2013**

<http://sheffieldmoors.co.uk>

# **CONTENTS PAGE**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Structure of the Sheffield Moors Partnership Response**
- 3. Sheffield Moors Partnership Response**
  - 3.1 Being Involved**
  - 3.2 Access and Recreation**
  - 3.3.Sustainable Land Management**
  - 3.4 Making the most of the wider benefits of the moors**
  - 3.5 Delivering the masterplan**
  - 3.6 The Draft Vision**
  - 3.7 The Draft masterplan appendices**
  - 3.8 The Draft masterplan maps**
  - 3.9 The structure of the draft masterplan**
  - 3.10 Any other comments**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document directly relates to 'Part 1', the collated consultation comments received by the Sheffield Moors Partnership which brings together all the comments received during the consultation process on the draft masterplan for the Sheffield Moors.

With the 'Part 1' document, the consultation comments received have been grouped into 'topic' areas. The 'key issue' that was raised by each group of comments has then been summarised and given a specific 'Reference Number'.

In all, 175 key issues were highlighted.

In this, the 'Part 2' document, each 'key issue' is taken in turn and:

- a) The 'Sheffield Moors Partnership Response' to the key issue raised is given, followed by
- b) A description of the changes proposed to the masterplan as a result of the key issue raised, where appropriate.

## 2. STRUCTURE OF THE SMP RESPONSE

Page 79

As set out in Part 1, each key issue has been grouped by theme as indicated below using the same reference number as within the Part 1 document:

- Being Involved
- Access and Recreation
- Sustainable Land Management
- Making the most of the Wider Benefits of the Moors
- Delivering the masterplan
- The Draft Vision
- The Draft masterplan appendices
- The Draft masterplan maps
- The structure of the draft masterplan
- Any other comments that did not fit into the above categories

If you have further questions or comments on items within this document, please contact us via <http://www.sheffieldmoors.co.uk/contact-us.html> or on 01433 670368.

## 3. SHEFFIELD MOORS PARTNERSHIP RESPONSE

### 3.1 Being Involved

<b>THEME: BEING INVOLVED</b>			
<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Summary of key issue from the comments</b>	<b>SMP Response</b>	<b>Changes required to the masterplan</b>
3.1.1	There is support for more education to deliver a variety of outcomes	<p>There is general support for education from participants in the consultation and from the partners. Education is a catch-all term that could include formal or informal education, events, guided walks, volunteering, interpretation etc. The SMP acknowledges that it is key to achieving the Vision.</p> <p>In addition, Strategic Outcome 1.3 acknowledges this support, whilst the 'Key Actions table' 1.3 (a) goes into more detail.</p>	None proposed.
3.1.2	That education and interpretation are unnecessary	<p>The SMP disagrees with this view. Education and interpretation have a very valuable role to play in improving visitors understanding and enjoyment of the landscapes they visit, and can help encourage people who don't often visit areas like the Peak District (for various reasons) to make the most of their natural heritage.</p> <p>Individual organisations currently run their own volunteering programmes which vary from outdoor-based community work days, to office based volunteering (usually both). All have a differing approaches &amp; resources. The benefits of the partnership</p>	None
3.1.3	How does the partnership/plan add to the voluntary work currently undertaken in the Sheffield Moors and increase the quality of volunteering?		<p>Strategic Outcome 1.3 (Inspiring activities &amp; engagement) to be amended to specifically mention volunteering.</p> <p>Acknowledgment of the role of volunteering in achieving the targets set</p>

**THEME: BEING INVOLVED**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>are that we can come together and share best practise, with a view to creating a better co-ordinated programme of opportunities, and this be communicated through the SMP website.</p> <p>As such, a cross-partner liaison group is to be set up as mentioned 'Key Action' 1.1 (a), to promote more co-ordinated delivery</p>	<p>out under each theme will be added to Key Action 1.1 (a) in respect of 'Lead Organisations'.</p>
3.1.4	<p>Suggestion of a greater emphasis on the health benefits of the Sheffield Moors in the masterplan.</p>	<p>The health benefits of the countryside are well documented (e.g. Natural England's Our Natural Health Service 2009 report). We recognise the benefits and these need to be reflected in the Plan.</p>	<p>Strategic Outcome 1.3 (Inspiring activities &amp; engagement) to be amended to include a sentence acknowledging the inherent qualities of, and aspiring to build on, the benefits of the moors for physical and mental health, and wellbeing.</p> <p>Key Delivery Action 1.3 – Greater acknowledgement of the benefits to health &amp; well-being (in addition to the awareness, understanding and enjoyment) will be added here</p> <p>We will also use the term 'users' instead of 'visitors' in some parts of the plan where appropriate.</p>
3.1.5	<p>There is a need to make greater links to the farming community and their buy-in to delivering the strategy</p>	<p>The SMP acknowledges the significant contribution that the farming community makes to the landscape (and habitats) as well as the economy - in particular through livestock grazing but also through land</p>	<p>Key Delivery Action 3.4 will be strengthened to include the on-going support the wider partnership, especially the Peak District National Park Authority provides to the farming community</p>

**THEME: BEING INVOLVED**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>management contracts (walling, fencing etc.). This is included in Strategic Outcomes 1.1 and 3.4 in particular</p> <p>The partners in the SMP value the input from tenant graziers, local landowners and farmers and work closely with them to ensure that conservation objectives are clear and achievable where related to livestock grazing, whilst ensuring that farming is sustainable.</p> <p>Much of the biodiversity-related work is undertaken through Higher Level Stewardship scheme grant programmes from Natural England, with work delivered through farmers and land managers working together.</p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority also provide a Land Management Advisory Service (PDLMAS) that delivers integrated advice and support to farmers and land managers to enable farms and other land use businesses to achieve national park purposes. At the same time, the Peak District Land Managers Forum provides a regular opportunity for those from the farming community and other land managing bodies to meet together and work collaboratively to help support each other</p>	

**THEME: BEING INVOLVED**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.1.6	Derbyshire County Council would like to be more involved in delivering some of the key outcomes in the masterplan	Thank you. The SMP agrees with this proposal.	None proposed
3.1.7	Request for greater recognition in the masterplan of the existing contribution of stakeholders into the management of the landscape	The SMP acknowledges the significant contribution of a variety of stakeholders – both historically and through the recent master plan consultation.	This will be more greatly acknowledged in the Introduction to the masterplan.  The 'Why Do This?' section will also be updated to emphasise the origins of the thinking behind the SMP i.e. that it is all of the Sheffield Moors is public or quasi-public land, and there has always been a high level of public involvement which the SMP is building on and celebrating.
3.1.8	Request for use of new information technology such as pod scrolls and other virtual means to aid the 'visitor experience' instead of fixed interpretation and signage	The SMP recognises that the balance between on-site interpretation and visual intrusion is one that has in the past been difficult to find. However, the partnership also recognises that with the on-going development of information technology there is great potential to provide high quality, up-to-date information about the sites and the landscape for example, with use of QR codes, smart phones etc to help tell the stories and history of the landscape.	The use of new technology will be made be more explicit in Strategic Objective 1.2.
3.1.9	How will the partnership manage priorities about the development of existing visitor 'hubs'?	Further exploration is proposed before prioritisation begins, as set out at Key Action 1.2 (b).	None proposed.

**THEME: BEING INVOLVED**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.1.10	<p>Why is Ecclesall Woods Woodland Discovery Centre in the proposals for visitor engagement when it is not within the Sheffield Moors area?</p>	<p>Whilst the Sheffield Moors sit within a clearly definable boundary, the audiences (and potential audiences) that the SMP aspires to engage do not have such boundaries.</p> <p>Ecclesall Woods Woodland Discovery Centre, in south west Sheffield, is just a few miles from the Sheffield Moors and provides an important centre for promoting and raising awareness of the Sheffield Moors, as well as engaging people in woodlands and countryside in general. The Centre is managed by Sheffield City Council.</p>	None proposed.



## 3.2 Access and Recreation

### THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.1	That the moors are 'open' and should be kept free of restrictions on access such as fences or 'no go' areas	<p>Agreed in principle.</p> <p>Most of the Sheffield Moors are 'access land' as defined in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, meaning there is open access on foot across the majority of the landscape. Other users on horse or bicycle are legally restricted to bridleways, and those in motor vehicles to byways open to all traffic, such as the Houndkirk Road on Burbage Moors.</p> <p>Temporary fencing may be needed from time to time, for example to protect new woodland whilst it is establishing. However, any temporary fencing area would require clear justifications and would always include regularly placed access structures to allow continued public access.</p>	None proposed
3.2.2	Considerable support was expressed for a more integrated access network across the Sheffield Moors	Thank you for your support	None proposed
3.2.3	There is support for improving legitimate access for cycle and horse-riding interests	Thank you for your support	None proposed
3.2.4	Concerns raised that there is already a good network of public bridleways and footpaths, and any	At present the existing network of bridleways and other multi-user routes into and across the Sheffield Moors is not	None proposed

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
	<p>funding should be spent on maintaining the existing network. Conversion of some footpaths to bridleways would lead to wider routes and scar the landscape as well as adversely affecting the peaceful enjoyment of the countryside</p>	<p>integrated - a number of routes are effectively 'dead ends' that restrict visitor movement around the Sheffield Moors as a whole. There are effectively a series of 'gaps' in the access network - for example between the bridleway on White Edge at Longshaw and Moss Road bridleway on Totley Moor - which at present can only be overcome by using what are busy road networks. This creates a barrier to visitor movements around the landscape. The masterplan proposes a considered approach to creating a more joined up network that will allow more user groups to enjoy the landscape as a whole, and in a safer manner. Potential new bridleway routes or changes from footpath and bridleway will be preceded and informed by consultation with the two Local Access Forums, land managers and user groups including statutory bodies such as Natural England, because most of the Sheffield Moors is a protected landscape. Any work undertaken on the ground will be sympathetic to the national importance of the landscape and will bear in mind the future maintenance implications</p>	
3.2.5	<p>That more emphasis is made in the masterplan about the wider benefits of access and recreation such as physical and mental well-being, and the need for contact</p>	<p>Noted, and the SMP is happy to add emphasis to this to the masterplan</p>	<p>Greater mention of the health and well-being benefits of access to nature will be included in the masterplan, and the wording of Strategic Outcome 1.2 'High Quality Visitor Experience will be</p>

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.6	<p>with nature in an increasingly urban world</p> <p>That the SMP's approach to public transport and its integration with the public rights of way network be made more explicit and strengthened in the masterplan</p>	<p>Agreed. The masterplan will contribute to the delivery of the Peak District National Park Management Plan, prepared by the PDNPA. This plan encourages visitors to consider their impact in travelling to, from and around the National Park, promoting the use of the Peak District's bus, rail and cycle network through the likes of <u>Peak Connections</u>. Using more sustainable means to access recreational opportunity in the national park not only benefits the environment, but also can play a role in maintaining personal health and well-being. Whilst much of this work is being led by the PDNPA, the other partners in the SMP will provide a supporting role as opportunities arise</p>	<p>strengthened' to add emphasis on these benefits</p> <p>The SMP role in promoting public transport and its integration with the public rights of way network will be made more explicit with the masterplan by expanding Strategic Objective 2.2 'A connected access network' and the related 'key delivery actions' in the first five years of the masterplan</p>
3.2.7	<p>Suggested that the key 'gateways' into the landscape should be the (public) transport hubs that surround the Sheffield Moors like Hathersage and Calver Sough, rather than those in open country such as Stanage and Redmires</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>The term 'gateway' will be dropped. Instead, two levels of access into the area will be defined in the masterplan. One that relates to 'transport hubs' that serve local communities as well as visitors to the area such as Hathersage and Calver Sough. These hubs are areas where there is a concentration of public transport, such as bus links, train stations and related infrastructure. Secondly, 'key entrance points' that form the main points</p>

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.8	<p>There is a variety of views about proposals to improve the recreational infrastructure at the Redmires/Long Causeway entrance to the Sheffield Moors. The concerns relate to the potential for this to lead to increased recreational pressure on Hallam and Stanage Moors, where some of the access infrastructure is already considered to be suffering from lack of maintenance</p>	<p>From the 'ideas gathering workshops' and other feedback received prior to the draft masterplan being prepared, there was a strong weight of opinion that the current recreational infrastructure that serves Redmires is not fit for purpose. At the same time, for those living in North-west Sheffield, especially Fulwood and Lodgemoor, Redmires and the Long Causeway will continue to be the main point of access into the Sheffield Moors, and as such, the view of the SMP is that in the medium term action is needed to address the current problems. However, the intention is not to increase visitor numbers but simply to provide better facilities and visitor management to reduce some of the current conflicts between users, especially around the Redmires Road entrance to the Long Causeway.</p> <p>At this stage, no definitive proposals for what any improvement to or better maintenance the current facilities would</p>	<p>of access into the landscape itself, either through travel from the transport hubs, or travel directly to them from elsewhere. Strengthening the public rights of way and public transport links between these gateways and the 'key entrance points' into the Sheffield Moors will also more explicitly built into the document and visioning maps</p> <p>The wording in the masterplan will be clarified to emphasise the need for proper engagement and consultation with stakeholders at the 'ideas stage'</p>

## THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>look like have been developed, and it is recognised that any change would require more focused engagement and consultation with users, landowners and managers, and other stakeholders, led by SCC and Yorkshire Water. This is why the target date for developing any firm proposals is 2016.</p> <p>In terms of concerns about the detrimental impact of recreation on grouse shooting interests on Hallam and Stanage Moors, the SMP will continue to work with visitors and landowners, through education and other awareness raising programmes to reduce conflicts with other land management priorities</p>	
3.2.9	That the Peak District and Sheffield Local Access Forums have a key role in informing the proposals related to Theme 2 'Access and Recreation'	Agreed.	The key role of the Local Access Forum's will be emphasised in the masterplan.
3.2.10	That any changes to the access network need careful and considered consultation and involvement of stakeholders including farming and conservation interests in what is a internationally designated landscape	Agreed.	The text within the masterplan will be strengthened to more strongly emphasise the need for the involvement of all relevant agencies, such as the Local Access Forums, Natural England and other relevant stakeholder groups in the planning and design of all proposed changes to the access network, to ensure proper account of land management, conservation, and other interests is

## THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.11	That the some of the access infrastructure proposals be implemented more quickly that the masterplan indicates	The 'Key Delivery Actions' include proposed changes and additions to the access network over the next five years. However, as noted above, some of the proposals could have an adverse impact on other interests and existing users, and require careful planning and consultation. In some cases, this may mean some proposals are not taken forward or are radically altered. In all cases, the SMP will work to deliver the proposals in partnership with users and representative bodies in a collaborative approach wherever possible	properly taken account of at an early stage. No changes are proposed
3.2.12	That reference to a planned funding bid to the Natural England 'Paths for Communities' grant award, for the Eastern Moors, be removed from the masterplan	Agreed. This funding opportunity is restricted to path improvements that will result in the creation of new definitive rights of way, and is therefore not appropriate for the proposed permissive bridleways on Eastern Moors. However, there may be other opportunities in other parts of the Sheffield Moors to secure this funding source	Reference to this funding bid in relation to the Eastern Moors will be removed from the masterplan
3.2.13	Support expressed for the creation of bridleways from Stanage Edge to Hathersage and through Greenwood Farm to Grindleford Station	Thank you.	None proposed
3.2.14	New bridleways proposed from Greenwood Farm alongside the River Derwent to Hathersage	Thank you for this suggestion. This proposed link will be discussed by the SMP, with the Public Rights of Way Team	None at this stage

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.15	<p>There are a variety of views regarding proposals to create a bridleway route in the Burbage Valley, and the potential impacts on existing users</p>	<p>for Derbyshire County Council and the Access Team within the Peak District National Park Authority, and consideration given to the proposal.</p> <p>From the 'ideas gathering workshops' and other feedback received prior to the draft masterplan being prepared, there was a clear desire for the development of a bridleway route in the Burbage Valley, especially if this was linked to proposals to introduce horse and cycle access into the adjoining Longshaw area, and link into the wider bridleway network.</p> <p>However, the SMP is also very much aware of the sensitivities of this proposal and the potential for detrimental impacts on walkers and families who already use the Burbage Valley, especially the 'Green Drive', a public footpath from Upper Burbage to Toads Mouth.</p> <p>At this stage, no definitive proposals for a bridleway route have been set out, and any moves towards implementing the broad proposal in the masterplan would be subject to detailed engagement and consultation with stakeholders before any decision on progressing this proposal is made</p>	<p>To strengthen the masterplan text to emphasise the approach to stakeholder engagement and consultation in developing any detailed proposals for bridleways in the Sheffield Moors</p>

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.16	Concerns raised about proposals to change a footpath to a bridleway from Ringinglow Road to Porter Clough	This proposal is an aspiration at this stage, and the SMP recognises that detailed planning and consultation will be needed before the suggestion could be taken forward to ensure land management and nature conservation interests are properly considered	To strengthen the masterplan text to emphasise the approach to stakeholder engagement and consultation in developing any detailed proposals for further bridleways in the Sheffield Moors
3.2.17	Support for and against changing the footpath along the top of Froggatt and Curbar Edge to a bridleway	<p>The proposal to create a permissive bridleway along Curbar and Froggatt edges forms part of the Eastern Moors Management Plan, agreed in 2012 following extensive public and other stakeholder consultation in 2010 and 2011, and this proposal received general support as long as the change was managed well, and monitored if implemented.</p> <p>A consultation meeting with representative groups from a variety of interests took place in summer 2012, and a detailed proposal is currently being worked up by the Eastern Moors Partnership. Subject to Natural England consent (as the area is a Site of Special Scientific Interest), work on the ground to allow a permissive bridleway will be undertaken in winter 2013/14 and the route officially opened in Spring 2014</p>	None proposed
3.2.18	That legitimate horse-riding and cycle access be improved on Hallam Moors, with links to Wyming Brook and to the Long	Thank you for this suggestion. In due course, these proposed links will be discussed by the SMP, with the Public Rights of Way Team for Sheffield City	No changes planned to the masterplan at present



**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.19	Causeway at Redmires, through the creation of new bridleways	Council, the landowner and the Access Team within the Peak District National Park Authority, and consideration given to the proposal.	
3.2.20	That multi-user routes are well designed (maximising width) and managed (good sightlines etc) to reduce the potential for conflict between different users	Where appropriate, this will be considered. However, it is important to recognise that the Sheffield Moors is a nationally protected and designated landscape. There will be many areas where over-riding landscape, nature conservation, geological, archaeological or other interests take precedent and have a major influence on the design and management of public rights of way	None proposed.
3.2.20	That long-standing proposals for a bridleway route and horse-riding access, together with a mountain bike route be taken forward in Lady Canning's Plantation, Ringinglow	The proposal for a bridleway link through Lady Canning's Plantation, between Houndkirk Road and Jumble Road byways is included in the masterplan, and it is hoped that Sheffield City Council's Public Rights of Way team will implement this in the next few years. Sheffield City Council's Parks and Countryside Service are also looking to develop a dedicated mountain bike route, separately from the planned bridleway in the next few years, within Lady Canning's Plantation, working with the mountain bike community and other stakeholders	Specific mention of the planned dedicated mountain biking route in Lady Canning's Plantation will be added to the masterplan and the key delivery targets for 2013-2018

## THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.21	Support expressed for more dedicated and permissible routes for mountain biking, and a request for the involvement of the mountain bike representative organisations like Ride Sheffield in access proposals that could impact on mountain biking interests	The SMP welcomes this view, and will work collectively with Ride Sheffield and other stakeholders to take appropriate opportunities to compliment the current access network for mountain bikers.	None proposed
3.2.22	That any (new) car parks are designed to be welcoming and sympathetic to the landscape, and are developed in consultation with stakeholders such as adjoining landowners and farming tenants	Agreed	None proposed
3.2.23	That car parks include provision for horse-boxes, and are developed in consultation with the British Horse Society	Agreed that where reasonably practical consideration of the provision of horse-boxes in car parks will be built into any future proposals for new or refurbished car parks in the Sheffield Moors, and that the BHS will be consulted on proposals	None proposed
3.2.24	That more specific mention of access for the disabled, for example at Lady Canning's Plantation and Longshaw, is included in the masterplan	All of the partners in the Sheffield Moors support the need to take appropriate opportunities to increase access to the countryside for the disabled	The wording for Strategic Outcome 2.3 'An Accessible Landscape' will be strengthened to specifically mention access for the disabled
3.2.25	That the 'Right to Roam' is not a good idea	The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 is now in place, and provides a right of access on foot across much of the Sheffield Moors, as 'access land'. However, this is not explicitly a 'right to roam' for all users	None proposed

## THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.26	That access structures on bridleways are fit for purpose wherever possible, including horse-rides with disabilities. Consultation with the British Horse Society on bridleway proposals would also be welcomed	Agreed, in conjunction with consultation with other stakeholders such as cyclists and walkers, and those with disabilities	None proposed
3.2.27	A request that for Strategic Outcome 2.3, the second paragraph 'Where appropriate, routes and infrastructure are developed along the lines of least restrictive access and promoted as such', the words 'least restrictive access' be removed.	Disagreed. Under the 2010 Equality Act, Highway Authorities, who have statutory responsibility for Public Rights of Way, are duty bound to consider the least restrictive access structures when planning changes to existing structures or new structures, so as not to impede the access rights of legitimate users including those with disabilities	None proposed
3.2.28	That repairs and re-surfacing of PROW should be done sympathetically with regard to users, materials, and the landscape	Agreed.	None proposed
3.2.29	That use by 4x4 vehicles (and motorbikes) of the Long Causeway and Houndkirk Road byways and sometimes on the moors themselves, is causing unacceptable damage to the path surfaces as well as conflict with other users	The concerns and issues raised are fully understood by the SMP.  The Peak District National Park Authority has recently concluded a public consultation concerning a proposed Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting motor vehicles from Long Causeway to prevent their impacts on the National Park. A decision on	None proposed

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>this will be taken in 2013.</p> <p>At present, there are no proposals to change the status of the Houndkirk Road byway. Work in the last few years has greatly reduced access and egress by 4 x 4 vehicles off the byway, and the byway surface has been greatly improved.</p> <p>Maintenance of the surface of the byways is the responsibility of the Highway Authorities</p>	
3.2.30	That dog waste is a problem and that dog waste bins could be considered	<p>It is agreed that dog waste be a problem at some specific sites and especially some specific entrances to the Sheffield Moors. However, at present the focus of the SMP is one of education and awareness raising to help reduce these problems.</p> <p>Agreed, however slightly differing regulations apply depending whether you are on a public path or on access land.</p>	None proposed at present but the SMP will keep this matter under review.
3.2.31	That dog owners are responsible, and take proper consideration and care near stock such as sheep	<p>On a public right of way, we would encourage dogs to be on a lead during the lambing and bird breeding season, and at all other times be under control. On CROW Access Land, should a user not be on a public right of way, dogs should be on a short lead from the 1<sup>st</sup> March to 31<sup>st</sup> July, and at all other times under control.</p>	None proposed

## THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.32	Concerns expressed about no admittance signs for dog walkers at a public right of way close to Redmires Car Park, leading onto Hallam Moors	<p>Under the CROW Act 2000, the owner of Hallam Moors has applied for and been given approval by Natural England to restrict access for dogs from Hallam Moors until 22nd October 2014 due to grouse shooting interests. It is the landowner's responsibility to enforce this and provide information on the ground.</p> <p>For more information go to the Peak District National Park Authority's website at: <a href="http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/visiting/crow/crow-restrictions">http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/visiting/crow/crow-restrictions</a></p>	None proposed
3.2.33	That fly-tipping and litter are a problem, and that more awareness raising and education is needed to reduce the problem	<p>It is agreed that litter and fly-tipping can be a problem within the Sheffield Moors, especially a certain sites. All of the partner organisations provide education programmes, especially for young people, as well as events for people of all ages to raise awareness of the importance and sensitive nature of the landscape. At the same time, all the land managing bodies have systems in place to monitor their land holdings and remove litter and fly-tipping as soon as possible.</p> <p>Due to the protected nature of the Sheffield Moors landscape for nature conservation and other interests, permission for fires is not given. There is also a very real risk of a fire spreading and causing serious damage</p>	None proposed
3.2.34	Clarity requested on the whether permission is needed to light fires and concerns about the potential for fire damage	<p>Due to the protected nature of the Sheffield Moors landscape for nature conservation and other interests, permission for fires is not given. There is also a very real risk of a fire spreading and causing serious damage</p>	None proposed

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.35	<p>A variety of views were expressed regarding car parking. These ranged from views that car parking fees should be limited because they may discourage visitors, to those that feel that car parking should be minimised to discourage over-use of the area</p> <p>That consideration be given to reciprocal parking rights across all land managing organisations in the Sheffield Moors</p>	<p>to moorland habitats, as has happened in the past on Burbage Moors for example.</p> <p>Whilst all of the partners encourage visitors to arrive by public transport wherever possible, many visitors do visit the Sheffield Moors by private car, and some level of car park provision is needed to provide safe, off road parking facilities to meet this demand. However, there are no proposals in the five year Key Delivery Actions to create any new car parks.</p> <p>At the same time, caring for special areas like the Sheffield Moors costs money, whether it's repairing stiles and footpaths, rebuilding historic farm buildings, or managing areas for wildlife. The revenue generated from the car park charges is re-invested back into the care and management of the Sheffield Moors.</p> <p>The idea of reciprocal parking rights across all land managing organisations in the Sheffield Moors is an interesting point, and one that the SMP will consider.</p>	<p>That the SMP consider the potential for reciprocal parking rights across the land managing organisations</p>
3.2.36	<p>A request for a pay and display at Surprise View car park that accepts cash, and for an additional machine at Curbar Gap car park</p>	<p>The previous cash based car park paying machine at Surprise View was repeatedly vandalised and the cash stolen. Hence its replacement with a card only machine.</p> <p>The Eastern Moors Partnership (EMP) does not feel an additional machine is</p>	<p>None at present</p>

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.37	That the national and international importance of the Sheffield Moors to the climbing community should be more emphasised in the masterplan	needed at Curbar Gap car park at present, but will keep the situation under review. Should queuing become a significant issue then the EMP will consider installing an additional car parking machine Agreed.	The text of the masterplan will be strengthened to emphasise the national and international importance of the Sheffield Moors to the climbing community
3.2.38	Concerns that should the management arrangements for Stanage and North Lees change, that rights of access for climbers could be adversely affected	The Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) is currently considering the future management arrangements for the North Lees and Stanage Estate, which it owns and manages in-house at present.  Whatever the outcome of the above, the PDNPA would not contemplate any restrictions or changes to existing access rights for any group of users.  Stanage Edge and much of the North Lees Estate is designated open access under the CROW Act, which further protects public access.	None proposed
3.2.39	That the masterplan takes the real and potential conflict between different user groups more seriously, and encourages more mutual understanding	Whilst the Sheffield Moors Partnership recognises that conflicts can occur, our view is that perceptions of conflict are probably higher than the reality.  At a strategic level the two Local Access Forums for the Peak District, and Sheffield	None proposed

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.40	Concerned that a recent padlock on Houndkirk byway - Ringinglow end, where moorland starts, had been fitted and made it difficult for cyclists to get onto the track	<p>respectively encourage mutual understanding and conflict resolution between different user groups. This is complemented by other forums that bring together representatives from access, wildlife and archaeological groups such as the Stanage Forum and the Eastern Moors Stakeholder Forum.</p> <p>On the ground, the National Park Ranger service as well as the those employed by the wider Sheffield Moors partners, will pro-actively work to resolve conflicts that they come across in their day to day work</p> <p>Thank you for bringing this to our attention. A site visit in March 2013 revealed there was no latch to lock either the field gate or the kissing gate at this access point onto Burbage Moors. This will be remedied in the near future, and implemented to allow straightforward access for users</p>	None proposed
3.2.41	Good work done by Sheffield Wildlife Trust at Piper House Gate area of Blacka Moor on the paths	Thank you for your support. The work on the ground as done by SCC Public Rights of Way Team	None proposed
3.2.42	That the South Yorkshire Freight Partnership would be welcome to be involved in any discussions relating to freight issues in the Sheffield Moors	Thank you for your interest, and for bringing the South Yorkshire Freight Partnership to the attention of the SMP. Should issues relevant to freight arise in relation to the Sheffield Moors, the SMP would welcome discussion with the SY Freight Partnership	None proposed



**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.2.43	That the proposal to develop a low-key camping facility in Lady Canning's Plantation, at Ringinglow, could necessitate related facilities that could be difficult to achieve such as toilets, road access and water	Noted. Sheffield City Council (SCC) is at an early stage of developing its ideas for a potential low-key camping site within Lady Canning's Plantation, a site they own and manage. Any proposal would need to be in accordance with the appropriate planning regulations which protect the Peak District National Park from inappropriate development. At the same time, SCC will seek the views of stakeholders should this idea start to become a more realistic proposal	None proposed
3.2.44	That proposals to develop the camping offer at the Eric Byne campsite near the Robin Hood public house (next to the B6060 Baslow to Chesterfield Road) be kept general at this stage until ideas are more firmed up	Agreed. The Eastern Moors Partnership is at a very early stage of its thinking with respect to the Eric Byne campsite, and this is reflected in the masterplan	None proposed
3.2.45	Is there the potential to develop a Sheffield Moors branded walk or access route?	This is an interesting idea, and something the SMP will consider. Thank you for the suggestion	None proposed in terms of the masterplan
3.2.46	That the masterplan does not give priority to one access community over another, more specifically horse-riding over walkers	Agreed. The masterplan has been informed by the ideas gathering workshops and other consultation the SMP have undertaken through 2012. Whilst access for those on foot is very well catered for through the extensive public footpath network into and across the Sheffield Moors (and the open access rights for those on foot within the Countryside and	None proposed

**THEME: ACCESS AND RECREATION**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>Rights of Way Act 2000), it is evident that multi-user routes are poorly represented and badly connected across, and in places into the Sheffield Moors from adjoining 'gateways' such as Hathersage.                      Recognition of these issues has helped inform the proposals within the masterplan</p>	

### 3.3 Sustainable Land Management

#### THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.1	That there should be some emphasis on the future as well as the past in Strategic Outcome 3.1 regarding conservation and enhancement of the landscape	We acknowledge this and suggest that reference be made to future management which provides resilience against and to the predicted effects of climate change and meets the needs of future generations of users.	Strategic Outcome 3.1 be amended to acknowledge climate change and needs of future generations of users.
3.3.2	That the importance of woodland in the landscape be strengthened in the masterplan text	The masterplan sets ambitious targets for the creation of new woodland. The role woodland can play in delivering biodiversity and public goods benefits (e.g. flood alleviation) is acknowledged. However, little emphasis is given to the role that woodland can play in enhancing the landscape, for example, now new woodlands create “soft edges” as they link isolated woodland blocks.	Specific reference to be made to the role of woodland in enhancing the landscape in an appropriate delivery action, in the ‘Key Actions’ table.
3.3.3	The Sheffield Moors are an open landscape where fences should be avoided	The masterplan recognises the need and desire to maintain the SMP area as an open landscape and wherever possible, the erection of new fences should be avoided. However, in some cases, for example, in order to manage livestock grazing to restore internationally important habitats or for the creation of new woodlands, then the erection of new fences may be necessary. Where new fences are necessary, access stiles will be installed at appropriate intervals and the line of the fence will be made as unobtrusive as possible in the landscape. Any fences which are no longer required for habitat restoration or livestock management should be removed.	None proposed.

**THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.4	Support for the Strategic Outcome 3.3 Management to achieve outstanding biodiversity and protect geo-diversity	We acknowledge and thank you for your support.	None proposed.
3.3.5	That the Strategic Outcome 3.3 is reworded to be 'conserve' rather than 'protect' geo-diversity	We thank you for your suggestion, however, we consider the definition of "conserve" and "protect" to be very similar and believe that the use of one or other word is largely down to a matter of personal preference.	None proposed.
3.3.6	The masterplan should include more up to date and stronger reference and information on the designated geological areas within the Sheffield Moors and the implications for management	<p>We acknowledge and recognise this and will add further information to the masterplan.</p> <p>In general terms there are no significant management issues arising from the geological designations that affect parts of the Sheffield Moors but they are still important (several areas are Geological Conservation Review sites for example). However, geology is a field based subject therefore access to features of interest, such as particular rock formations, is important and activities which obscure or reduce access to geological features should be avoided.</p> <p>At the same time, the detailed management of geological features is something that should be approached within individual site management plans, rather than the masterplan. For those areas of the Sheffield Moors that are Sites of Special Scientific Interest such as Burbage Moors, Natural England provide written guidance to land managers and owners on how features of conservation interest like geology, should be</p>	<p>Geology will be specifically mentioned in the 'Vision' for the Sheffield Moors</p> <p>A map showing designated geological areas will be included within the masterplan.</p> <p>The masterplan will be strengthened to highlight the importance of involving Natural England and other organisations that represent geological interests locally (specifically the Sheffield Area Geology Trust, and the Derbyshire Stone Centre) in any management proposals that could impact on areas of geological interest, as well as related monitoring</p> <p>In addition, the Peak District Local Nature Partnership has programmed the development of a 'Geo-diversity Action Plan' for Peak District is by 2015. This action will be added to the 'Key Actions'</p>

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.7	Clarity required on the definition of 'geo-diversity' and where geology fits into masterplan	<p>managed (through a written statement). This should be used to inform management at a site level.</p> <p>In simple terms, 'geo-diversity' is the variety of rocks, minerals, fossils, soils, landforms and natural processes. Geo-diversity is what produces the variety of landscapes found in the Sheffield Moors.</p> <p>Where geology fits into the masterplan is outlined in the response to the preceding key issue raised during the consultation</p>	for the first five years of the masterplan.
B.3.8	That the importance of the Sheffield Moors for archaeology be strengthened in the masterplan	<p>We acknowledge your comment, but believe, the importance of the Sheffield Moors for archaeology and that this archaeology is given as equal a weighting as is given to other themes, e.g. wildlife, geo-diversity and habitats. For example, the importance of the areas archaeology is referred to in the Introduction, Vision and a whole section is dedicated to cultural heritage and archaeology under "what makes the Sheffield Moors so Important".</p>	None proposed.
3.3.9	Support for extending, across all of the Sheffield Moors, the Eastern Moors Partnership approach to planning project work that takes proper account of archaeological interests,	<p>Thank you for the endorsement of the approach taken by the Eastern Moors Partnership (EMP) to the safeguard of archaeology during project planning. The approach EMP take to archaeology in this context has been shared with all the partners within the SMP.</p>	None proposed.
3.3.10	Support for proposals for further archaeological survey to complete survey of the whole	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>	None proposed.

**THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.11	<p>landscape and inform management and interpretation</p> <p>Suggested re-wording of Key Action 3.2b to reflect the increasing role of community based archaeological research, not just academic led research</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Key Action 3.2b will be re-worded to read "Opportunities to develop partnerships with Universities, local communities and interested individuals and volunteers, to further archaeological research and study are explored and encouraged.</p>
3.3.12	<p>The masterplan should broaden the remit of 'cultural heritage' to include national and international significance of the area to the history of climbing, access to the countryside and the creation of the designation of National Parks and the Green Belt around Sheffield. Reference should also be made to fact this is a landscape that supports farming.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Reference to the role of the Sheffield Moors in the history of access to the countryside and the creation and designation of National Parks and the Green Belt around Sheffield will be added to the 'Introduction'. Reference to the areas national and international importance for climbing will be included in the Cultural Heritage and Archaeology section under 'What Makes the Sheffield Moors so Important?' The value of the area for farming will also be referenced more here.</p>
3.3.13	<p>General support for the proposals to fell Burbage conifer plantations and replant them with native trees, but more information requested on how this will be done (including a suggestion of horse extraction) and that existing wildlife is protected</p>	<p>Thank you for your support for the proposal to fell Burbage conifer plantations and replant them with native trees. We appreciate that many people will want to comment of the specific designs, methodology and measures to protect existing wildlife, archaeology etc. However, the masterplan is a strategic document and not the place for such detail. Sheffield City Council, who own and manage the Burbage Plantations and the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area Project Manager</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.14	The masterplan should reflect the latest knowledge about ancient woodland and wooded landscapes	are currently preparing documents and information on this project to provide the public with full details of the proposal and to seek comments on its design, methodology and how people may wish to get involved. It is anticipated that this information will be available in early spring 2013. For more information, contact Ross Frazer, Project Manager on 07725 220648 or <a href="mailto:ross.frazer@rspb.org.uk">ross.frazer@rspb.org.uk</a> This is an exciting discovery and management recommendations are welcome. We feel that this issue is best dealt with at the individual management plan level and the comments will be passed onto the organisation responsible. The masterplan identifies areas for potential new woodland creation, which will help link up and reduce the isolation of these "ghost" woodlands.	None proposed.
3.3.15	General support for proposed woodland management and woodland creation. Potential to make use of the new Clough Woodland Project Officer, based with the Moors for the Future Partnership, to inform proposals	Thank you for your support for the proposed woodland management and creation and the offer of help from the Clough Woodland Project Officer. SMP partners will be encouraged to contact this Project Officer.	None proposed.
3.3.16	That a lead organisation should be identified for the woodland creation proposals	Key Action 3.3d begins with a generic objective to create new native woodland and scrub, targeted at cloughs and through the restructuring of existing conifer plantations. Under this generic objective the bulleted actions each relate to a specific project/location identified, for example, on the slopes below Stannage Edge. The final column identifies the lead partner responsible for the	None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.17	That trees planted in the landscape should come from local provenance where possible	works. These will vary, depending on the land managing body.  We support this idea wherever practical. The Eastern Moors Partnership, funded through the NIA, will shortly be purchasing poly-tunnels with the objective of working with local communities to grow tree seedlings which can be used for on site woodland creation projects.	None proposed.
3.3.18	That opportunities to make use of wood felled during management operations be emphasised more strongly in the masterplan	We agree with the suggestions. Several SMP partners are already exploring ways in which wood, created as a by product of habitat management i.e. thinning of plantations, could be used for other purposes and generate income to support the implementation of the masterplan.	None proposed.
3.3.19	Suggestion that Brown Edge Plantation be converted to broadleaves, and that a scrubby edge be created between Blacka Moor and Totley Moor	We welcome these suggestions. The SMP Steering Group will discuss the proposal to convert Brown Edge Plantation to broadleaves, with the owners – Sheffield City Council.  Preliminary discussions have already begun between SWT and EMP to create a scrubby edge on the moorland between the woodlands at Strawberry Lee, Blacka Moor and Totley Moor.	a) Subject to the response from Sheffield City Council, to include conversion of Brown Edge Plantation to native woodland as a specific action under Key Delivery Action 3.3d.  b) Include the creation of scrubby edge between Blacka Moor and Totley Moor as a specific action under Key Delivery Action 3.3h, with SWT and EMP as the lead organisations.
3.3.20	That consideration of Ash dieback is needed in the masterplan	We note and acknowledge the seriousness of Ash dieback and recognise that the management of this disease need to be factored into both the management of existing woodlands and the	None proposed



## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.21	<p>General support provided for more heather cutting and burning, but that this must be done sensitively to the conservation interests</p>	<p>creation of new woodland in the SMP area. However, we believe that this detailed work is best dealt with at the individual, Management Plan level, rather than in the strategic masterplan.</p> <p>Agreed. The masterplan identifies areas of heather dominated moorland where action to diversify both the species and structural diversity of the vegetation is required. Individual land managers, in consultation with Natural England, are responsible for deciding how best to undertake this work. However, three methods are available: Burning, cutting and grazing. The nature of the site will determine which of these methods are most appropriate. However, generally the SMP will follow the following principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No burning on blanket bog (defined as peat over 0.5 metres deep) due to the detrimental impact on blanket bog ecology, carbon stores and water quality.</li> <li>2. No cutting of heather (or other vegetation) on sites of high archaeological interest, due to the high likelihood of machinery damaging the archaeology.</li> </ol> <p>All management of vegetation should be done in a way that provides the additional benefits of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of fire brakes to help control potential wild fires.</li> <li>• Maximises biodiversity benefits.</li> <li>• Helps spread livestock grazing over the moor.</li> </ul>	None proposed

**THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.22	<p>Support for the principles of partnership working to achieve sustainable land management, but the masterplan should be more specific about what is expected of partners.</p> <p>That Figures 8-9 should provide greater clarification of what is proposed on the moors and the links to surrounding areas next to the Sheffield Moors</p> <p>The masterplan should display clearer integration with the Dark Peak NIA</p>	<p>Thank you for your support. The Sheffield Moors Partnership work to an agreed 'terms of reference' which define how we work together as a partnership. The Key Delivery Action Plan details the individual actions that each partner, or as appropriate the partners collectively, will take to deliver the masterplan</p> <p>It is recognised that these figures on habitat issues and proposals could be improved to better communicate what is proposed. These will be re-designed before the plan is finalised, and the links to the surrounding landscape strengthened</p> <p>The masterplan is helping to deliver the objectives of the Dark Peak NIA, which is clearly referenced within the draft masterplan. However, the SMP will review the text and strengthen it as appropriate to demonstrate the links</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>Figures 8 and 9 will be re-designed to improve their value in communicating proposed habitat management and restoration, as well as the links to the surrounding landscape</p> <p>Review and as necessary strengthen the text in the masterplan to demonstrate integration between the Dark Peak NIA and the masterplan</p>
3.3.23	<p>Suggested that land management should not be driven by grouse shooting interests</p>	<p>No "driven" or "walked up" grouse shoot operates within the Sheffield Moors and the SMP partners have a either a policy of no shooting on their land, or do not exercise the right to shoot. Critically any management introduced by the SMP must deliver multiple objectives, such as access and recreation, biodiversity, landscape, ecosystem services. Single issue management is unlikely to be adopted or be acceptable within the Sheffield Moors.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
3.3.24	<p>Concern that the Sheffield Moors masterplan will lead to 'over management' of the landscape and that the current</p>	<p>The habitats which occur on the Sheffield Moors are largely the result of human activity, albeit centuries ago. For example, the upland heaths are the result of historic clearance of natural forest</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

**THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
	<p>document is a missed opportunity to take a more 're-wilding' approach</p> <p>Concern that more public debate and consultation is required on proposals than has happened to date</p>	<p>thousands of years ago, followed by burning and grazing. If a "re-wilding" approach were taken across the whole of the moors, then in time all but the wettest and deepest blanket bogs would eventually return to woodland. Whilst an increase in woodland cover is desirable and indeed forms a major part of the masterplan, the open ground habitats now support many rare and unique species and their importance is recognised by the national and international conservations designations for the majority of the Sheffield Moors and key species. At the same time, the maintenance of these habitats does require some degree of habitat intervention. Ideally, this should be light touch, for example, extensive grazing using both wild animals (red deer, rabbits, hares) and hardy breed livestock. In effect what is proposed in the masterplan continues the existing direction of travel away from high density grazing supported by past subsidy regimes, towards more extensive grazing to encourage a 'wilder' more diverse landscape and habitats. The overall impact will be 'wilder' than the current position rather than leading to 'over management'.</p> <p>For example, the man made ditches which have drained the bogs and mires at Ringinglow and Leash Fen. To reverse this past drainage, we acknowledge that the masterplan proposes a programme of capital intensive restoration projects. These are required to restore the natural processes, currently broken, but which ultimately self regulate the habitat mosaic. For example,</p>	

**THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>water levels in peat are one of the primary determining factors which govern vegetation type and the extent and type of tree cover. Once the damages of past land management have been restored, there will be less of a requirement for interventionist management, as hydrology and sustainable grazing will determine the distribution of mix of habitats on the Sheffield Moors, thus management will over time become more extensive, working with the grain of nature to achieve the full range of habitats and species one would expect to find on the Sheffield Moors.</p> <p>The SMP consider that a full and robust public consultation has been undertaken on the masterplan and indeed is on going, as evidenced by this document. The key issues included in the masterplan have been drawn directly from stakeholders and the public during Stages 1 and 2 of the masterplan development.</p>	
3.3.25	Questioning the benefit of Strategic Outcome 3.5, that habitat management works are assessed against the likely impacts of climate change	<p>The SMP partners are aware that certain management techniques are likely to provide additional resilience against the predicted impacts of climate change. For example, land management which increases the wetness of peat will help protect bogs against predicted higher temperatures. Where there is the option to instil resilience or provide adaptation to climate change it would be prudent to do so, however all management techniques selected will still have to pass the “test” that they would not have a detrimental effect on an existing priority species or habitat, the areas cultural heritage and geo-</p>	None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.26	Support for Strategic Outcome 3.5	diversity, or any of the other special features of the Sheffield Moors. Thank you for your support.	None proposed.
3.3.27	All land management and habitat work should not be detrimental to biodiversity or cultural heritage interests	The SMP partnership agree with this statement and as individual organisations (and through shared best practice) will continue to fully monitor sites prior to the implementation of any new management to ensure that the needs of priority species and habitats present are not damaged and that exemplar project planning and management protects the species and cultural heritage identified through the monitoring.	None proposed.
3.3.28	That a variety of approaches to wildflower meadow restoration, as well as some reversion to arable crops (for conservation objectives) be considered	The SMP endorse this comment. The NT, SWT, and EMP are all trialling meadow restoration, funded through the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area programme. PDNPA have successfully restored a number of meadows at North Lees in recent years, and the masterplan sets an aspiration to do more of this across appropriate parts of the landscape.  We agree that upland arable should have an important role to play in diversifying moorland edge habitats and was once a core part of traditional, upland farming. However, new EA Regulations, protecting land that has been in grass for over 5 years, makes the objective of re-introducing upland arable or fodder crops difficult.	None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.29	That the masterplan should say more about traditional farming systems	Despite this EMP are currently trying to identify opportunities to trial this on the Eastern Moors and there may be small scale opportunities around Fox House on Houndkirk Moor.  Agreed, and in particular, the need to seek opportunities to reconnect the moor with adjacent in-bye grazing fields. Ideally, moorland and neighbouring in-bye field should be managed under one grazing system, as occurred under traditional farming systems, giving maximum management flexibility of both the livestock and the habitats.	Theme 3.4 “Appropriate grazing to achieve conservation objectives” will be modified to include the following – ‘Seek opportunities to re-connect moorland with adjacent in-bye grazing fields’.
3.3.30	The plan does recognise that farming is a tool to help meet conservation and other objectives	Thank you for this comment.	None proposed
3.3.31	That a release scheme be developed to re-introduce or boost lost of declining wildlife	There are clear guidelines, set by international bodies (specifically the International Union for Conservation and Nature) and Natural England, for both the appropriateness and criteria which need to be met when considering a proposed re-introduction. This applies to all species (with the exception of game birds). The SMP would have to meet all such criteria if it were to consider a re-introduction programme. There are no obvious species candidates for re-introduction to the Sheffield Moors area. Species lost historically like the red kite, are likely to re-colonise, given time, giving the success of re-introduction schemes in the Midlands and Yorkshire. The possible	None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.32	That there is greater emphasis on protecting and enhancing habitats for key moorland bird species	<p>exception is Black Grouse. However, Black Grouse require suitable habitats over an area of land even greater than the Sheffield Moors and two recent re-introduction schemes elsewhere in the Peak District have failed.</p> <p>The masterplan is a strategic document and the focus is on habitat restoration rather than specific management for individual species. A number of moorland birds found on the Sheffield Moors are of national and international importance. Specific management for these species, such as the maintenance of a mosaic of short (for feeding) and tall (for nesting) vegetation within ring ouzel territories is best covered in the management plans for individual sites.</p>	None proposed.
3.3.33	What is the partnership's approach to predator control?	<p>The SMP believe that predator control is only required if it can be scientifically proven that the conservation status of a species (or habitat) is declining and that predation is a key reason for this decline. The SMP would consider the introduction of legal predator control in order to improve the conservation status of the species or habitat concerned within the Sheffield Moors.</p>	None proposed
3.3.34	What is the partnership's approach to eliminating bird of prey persecution?	<p>All SMP partners totally condemn bird of prey persecution. It is illegal and deprives the public of a wildlife experience integral to the nature and character of the Peak District. The SMP partners will continue to work with the police to detect and prosecute anyone undertaking illegal bird of prey persecution. As individual organisations we will</p>	None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.35	That specific targeting of invasive species like bracken, Japanese knotweed and rhododendron management is included in the masterplan	also continue to lobby the government to introduce better and more robust laws to protect our wildlife. In addition, the Peak District Birds of Prey Working Group operates in the area. The Group formed in 2011, and involves five organisations – the National Trust, the PDNPA, Natural England, the Moorland Association and the RSPB – that have come together to set targets for healthy populations of birds of prey in the Peak District, and between them, fund independent fieldworkers to help achieve their aims working with local land managers and bird watching groups.	None proposed.
3.3.36	Concerns raised about the increase in cattle grazing at several sites	We acknowledge and understand this concern, however, it needs to be remembered that cattle grazing has been undertaken at many sites on the Sheffield Moors for decades, with no negative interactions between cattle and visitors. On the Eastern Moors and at Longshaw, only cattle breeds with docile natures are selected and no problems with the public have occurred. Cattle grazing is the optimal management tool for achieving species and structurally diverse habitats and we would like to see additional cattle grazing on new sites on the Sheffield Moors. It should be noted that no fencing will be required in order to introduce cattle to new sites.	None proposed.



## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.37	Support for extending cattle grazing and use of deer as a habitat management tool across the wider landscape	Thank you for your support.  Whilst the masterplan supports the use of extensive grazing including appropriate livestock and the resident red deer herd is the primary land management tool on the Sheffield Moors, decisions on individual land management areas will be agreed in liaison with Natural England.	None proposed
3.3.38	Preference for cattle grazing rather than sheep at Blacka Moor because of perceived potential conflict with dog walking	Cattle are used because they are most appropriate to maximise the conservation interest on the dry heath areas at Blacka Moors	None proposed.
3.3.39	Concerns expressed that cattle grazing may be detrimental to rare and characteristic plants that are part of site's conservation designation as Sites of Special Scientific Interest	Grazing by any animal species can be detrimental to a site's botanical interest if the site is either i) overgrazed ii) grazed at the wrong time of the year or iii) under grazed. As the majority of the Sheffield Moors area is designated as a SSSI, individual organisations will have to agree grazing plans with Natural England to ensure that optimal regimes are agreed for each site.	None proposed.
3.3.40	Suggestion that a re-wilding approach be taken for Burbage Moors to create areas of true wilderness	We refer to our earlier response to the Issue "Concern that the Sheffield Moors masterplan will lead to "over management" of the landscape and that the current document is a missed opportunity to take a more "re-wilding" approach".	None proposed.
3.3.41	Proposal that bracken be controlled beneath Stannage	As part of the Dark Peak NIA, bracken is being controlled for habitat reasons, to encourage more	None proposed

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
	Edge to reduce midge problems for visitors	dwarf shrubs like heather.  We are not aware of any known proven link between bracken and midge populations	
3.3.42	That path improvements do not damage sensitive wetland communities	All public right of way improvements should be undertaken in ways that minimise the impact on the hydrology and wildlife of the area.  This is implicit in Strategic Outcomes such as 3.1 Conservation and enhancement of the landscape, and 3.3 Management to achieve outstanding biodiversity and protect geo-diversity	None proposed
3.3.43	There are differing views on the approach to deer management from non-intervention to a more pro-active approach. Clarity on the partnership's approach would be welcomed	The red deer herd on the Sheffield Moors is one of only a few herds in the Peak District. The animals are largely centred on Big Moor, Totley Moss and Blacka Moor and only infrequently or in small numbers, visit other parts of the Sheffield Moors. Grazing by red deer – a large, natural herbivore – is considered a valuable part of the sustainable management of habitats found on the Sheffield Moors. Deer graze differently to commercial livestock and create valuable micro-biodiversity such as mud wallows. We are aware that in some circumstances, deer can create problems, such as unwanted grazing in gardens and competition with sheep for grazing on agricultural land. However, after a period of quite rapid growth, the population of deer on the Sheffield Moors is thought to be relatively stable at the moment, growing only very slowly.	None proposed – the masterplan already proposes that a deer management policy for the wider Sheffield Moors be developed and adopted by 2015 (Key Delivery Action 3.4a).

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.44	Questioning the future of parts of the Sheffield Moors as working and farmed landscapes because of the competing demands for recreation	<p>The Sheffield Moors provide some of the greatest public benefits – access and recreation, landscape, flood alleviation, wildlife etc – of any land area in the UK. It must also be recognised that in many aspects the area is also on urban fringe site, given its proximity to Sheffield. This can create tensions between the competing demands for recreation and commercial agriculture (referring here to intensive livestock grazing). However, the masterplan recognises that livestock grazing is essential for both the maintenance of habitats and the landscape. Whether one agrees with the principal or not, upland farming is heavily reliant upon subsidies to remain economically viable. In the past, subsidies were based on the number of animals, often to the detriment of the environment. A key principle of the masterplan is that farming is supported for management – livestock grazing – which delivers multi-benefits in the form of public goods such as wildlife, access, landscape and carbon management etc. Under such a system, the livestock are a management tool to help deliver these public goods and hence quantify the farm business for subsidy support (e.g. through agri-environment scheme funding), rather than the sole generator of commercial return for the business.</p>	<p>The final sentence in Strategic Outcome 3.4 ‘Appropriate grazing to achieve conservation objectives’, will be amended to read “This is delivered through long term partnership or with economically viable and environmentally sustainable farm businesses who are financially rewarded for their role as land managers and the delivery of a range of public benefits”.</p>
3.3.45	A variety of views were received on perceived conflicts between dogs walkers, their dogs, and sheep at Burbage	This is clearly an issue where people have very different and personal views, ranging from the many people enjoying seeing sheep on the moor and consider this part of their “countryside and	None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
	<p>Moors, including proposals to remove all grazing animals</p>	<p>outdoor” experience, to a number who consider that the presence of sheep poses and unnecessary restriction on their dogs behaviour. As in many other situations encountered within the Sheffield Moors, an approach can be taken to ensure that as many people as possible can enjoy the area that satisfies various points of view - an element of livestock grazing (be it sheep, cattle or red deer) is required to maintain the habitats, wildlife and landscape so valued by the areas many visitors come to enjoy. Equally, people should have the right to take their dogs with them where they visit these places. However, to ensure that all users can enjoy their visits and that wildlife and livestock are not unnecessarily disturbed we would advise the following:</p> <p>On a public right of way, we would encourage dogs to be on a lead during the lambing and bird breeding season, and at all other times be under control. On GROW Access Land, should a user not been on a public right of way, dogs should be on a short lead from the 1<sup>st</sup> March to 31<sup>st</sup> July, and at all other times under control.</p> <p>We refer you to the response above.</p>	
3.3.46	<p>Questioning the sustainability of sheep grazing at Burbage because of the stock loss to uncontrolled</p>	<p>Burbage Valley is owned by Sheffield City Council and leased to the National Trust, who sub-let the grazing rights to a grazier on a temporary grazing licence.</p>	None proposed.
3.3.47	<p>Clarity requested on the organisation responsible for sheep grazing at Burbage Valley</p>		None proposed.

## THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.48	What are the proposals for the redundant reservoirs (at Ramsley and Barbrook)?	The de-commissioned reservoirs at Barbrook and Ramsley are owned by Severn Trent Water. The EMP are currently negotiating the purchase of these reservoirs under which the freehold would transfer to PDNPA, upon which they would be automatically included in the Eastern Moors lease from PDNPA to EMP. EMP, as part of the Eastern Moors Management Plan, would then develop, in consultation with the public, management proposals for the reservoirs.	A new 'Key Action' will be included within the masterplan to incorporate the actions outlined in the preceding column.
3.3.49	Clarity requested on what is meant by Higher Level Stewardship, and clarifying the start date for the planned HLS agreement for Totley Moor	Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) is a government funded agri-environment scheme that pays landowners for management which delivers a range of public benefits – wildlife, landscape, access, archaeology etc. Schemes run for 10 years. The EMP is currently preparing a HLS application for Totley Moor, which would commence in November 2013. The EMP will be consulting fully with the Eastern Moors stakeholder Forum as part of the application process. The SMP masterplan and its objectives will drive the content of the HLS application.	None proposed.
3.3.50	Suggestion that the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area (NIA) designation is a planning designation	Natural England guidance is that it is for local planning authorities to decide how to recognise NIA's in their Local Plans. For more detail go to: <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/files/pb13824-nia-criteria.pdf">http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/files/pb13824-nia-criteria.pdf</a>	None proposed

**THEME: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT**

Reference Number	Summary of key issues from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.3.51	What can be done to ensure the masterplan improves facilities for people in our communities to enjoy our heritage?	The draft masterplan proposes a range of measures from access improvements, education and interpretation to collectively improve people's enjoyment of the heritage of the Sheffield Moors. For example, by providing a new bridleway in Lady Cannings Plantation at Ringinglow	None proposed

### 3.4 Making the Most of the Wider Benefits of the Moors

THEME: MAKING THE MOST OF THE WIDER BENEFITS OF THE MOORS			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.4.1	That the masterplan requires more emphasis on climate change, and what is the basis for the Partnership's current understanding of climate change?	Strategic Outcome 3.5 specifically references climate change, whilst 'Key Actions' 4.2 and 4.4 refer to actions to address the issue but we agree that the masterplan could be strengthened to include more reference to an understanding of the impact of climate change. More detail will also be included in individual site management plans on base line information	Greater reference to current knowledge and understanding of climate change will be added to the masterplan.  'Key Actions' for Strategic Outcome 4.4 will be strengthened to include reference to monitoring the impacts of climate change.
3.4.2	Support for moorland restoration and clough woodlands creation to reduce flood risk and improve water quality, and a partnership approach that helps deliver this.	Thank you for your support	None proposed
3.4.3	That the Strategic Outcome 4.4 'Water quality and storage is enhanced through management' be strengthened	As a strategic outcome, the SMP feel that the current wording is appropriate. However, reference to the European Union Water Framework Directive will be included in the masterplan, as this strongly informs projects and their delivery through the masterplan for the foreseeable future	To specifically reference the Water Framework Directive in the masterplan
3.4.4	What land management, apart from pollution control, can have a direct impact on water quality?	Habitat management and restoration can play a part in water storage and reducing flood risk.  At the same time, land management that leads to the exposure of bare peat can in turn result in peat erosion through water	None proposed

**THEME: MAKING THE MOST OF THE WIDER BENEFITS OF THE MOORS**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.4.5	How will the partnership influence national, regional and local plans, policies and strategic issues such CAP reform and the changing approach to ecosystem services?	Through individual partner representation and collective responses to policy consultations	None proposed
3.4.6	That the Water Framework Directive objectives are referenced in respect of Strategic Outcome 4.4	As a strategic outcome, the SMP feel that the current wording is appropriate. However, reference to the European Union Water Framework Directive will be included in the masterplan, as this strongly informs projects and their delivery through the masterplan for the foreseeable future	To specifically reference the Water Framework Directive in the masterplan
3.4.7	Suggestion that the list of products that can be sustainably harvested from the landscape is re-visited	Food, heather, wood and water are mentioned as examples only and are not meant to be exclusive.	None proposed
3.4.8	What opportunities are there to brand sustainably harvested products from the Sheffield Moors?	The plan refers to sustainably harvesting natural products but there is no reference to branding products. This is something which could be explored but is more likely to be on a wider Peak District basis.	None proposed. However, the SMP will explore the potential for branding Peak District products in conjunction with other partners.
3.4.9	What is the rationale for including specific Strategic Outcomes for the Sheffield Moors that relate to the 'economy' and 'sustainably harvesting natural products'?	This is in line with Government thinking in the Natural Environment White Paper and Natural Ecosystem Assessment in considering payment for ecosystem services	None proposed
3.4.10	What opportunities for local businesses and others that financially benefit from the quality of the landscape and the visitors	Key action 4.1 details potential opportunities and mechanisms	None proposed



**THEME: MAKING THE MOST OF THE WIDER BENEFITS OF THE MOORS**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.4.11	<p>this attracts, to contribute financially to the care of the Sheffield Moors?</p> <p>That for Theme 4, Recognising the wider value of the moors, the local economy is not the first ecosystem service listed</p>	<p>Support for the local economy is in balance with the conservation and recreational values of the landscape and would not compromise those values</p>	<p>Although not listed in any priority order, the ordering of the Strategic Outcomes within Theme 4 will be re-considered</p>
3.4.12	<p>That opportunities for more affordable housing (in the National Park) are taken</p>	<p>This is not the remit of the Sheffield Moors Partnership. It is dealt with in the Peak District National Park Authority's Local Development Framework (go to <a href="http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/looking-after/plansandpolicies/ldf">http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/looking-after/plansandpolicies/ldf</a> ) and by Housing Authorities and providers.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
3.4.13	<p>That wind-farms in this landscape should be opposed</p>	<p>Decisions on planning applications related to proposals for wind-farms in the National Park come under the remit of the planning department within the Peak District National Park Authority, not the SMP.</p> <p>For detailed guidance on the planning authority's policy on renewable energy, please refer to:  <a href="http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/advise/renewable-energy-and-planning">http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/advise/renewable-energy-and-planning</a></p>	<p>None proposed</p>

## 3.5 Delivering the masterplan

<b>THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN</b>			
<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Summary of key issue from the comments</b>	<b>SMP Response</b>	<b>Changes required to the masterplan</b>
3.5.1	Suggestion that the wording within the masterplan concerning how the Sheffield Moors partners work together be re-worded to make it clearer and more precise	It is acknowledged that phrase “fleet of foot” may not be understood by all. The SMP will work together in a way that ensures it achieves results. The aim is that as a group of organisations with a common strategic vision for the SMP area we can make decisions as land managers that deliver real benefits for wildlife and people.	Change wording as indicated. Add emphasis to the masterplan, that with an agreed vision and approach across the Sheffield Moors, the SMP will not get involved in the day to day management of sites, and that this is the role of individual land managing organisations
3.5.2	How can the SMP be lead organisation for so many of the key actions and how will this be resourced?	One of the roles of the SMP will be to come together as a Steering Group to drive and monitor delivery of the masterplan, informed by a shared common vision for the Sheffield Moors at a landscape scale.  Specific resources were allocated by the various partners in the SMP to enable the development of the masterplan. However, looking forward the SMP Steering Group will focus more on monitoring delivery of the masterplan using existing resources. The individual key actions in the masterplan are predominately the responsibility of the individual land management organisations. To support this, there are also proposals to develop an ‘Operational Group’ between the different land management organisations for staff based on the ground who deliver site work programmes. This will help, amongst other	None proposed.

**THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
B.5.3	What would happen if one of the partners were to leave the SMP or was replaced by another organisation?	<p>things, in sharing knowledge, joining up work packages when needed, and exploring opportunities for shared monitoring and contracting of work, for example.</p> <p>In the future, additional staff could potentially be funded to deliver specific projects, most likely from funds outside of the partnership, and secured by the partners working together (as happened in securing the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area programme).</p> <p>The partners are committed to working for the long-term future of the Sheffield Moors because we all have a long-term stake in this landscape, as land we manage. Clearly we hope that any of the existing partners would not leave but should that happen the work on the remaining land within the partnership could continue. The strength of the SMP is in its joined up and co-ordinated approach to land management at a landscape scale. We hope that the partnership will increase in membership to include other landowners/land managers in the future. The shared vision is what holds the partnership together. Therefore, there would be no issues with another organisation joining that was signed up to the vision and the masterplan's aspirations.</p>	None proposed

## THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.5.4	Support for the partnership approach to the management of the moors and the proposed 'key delivery actions'	Thank you for your support	None proposed.
3.5.5	That a more overall strategic approach to the presentation of the key actions that cuts across site boundaries would be beneficial	<p>The approach to the development of the masterplan was at a 'landscape scale'. However, the physical works proposed in the 'key actions' table will be delivered through site management plans by the individual partners, but in liaison and where appropriate collaboratively with other partners. For example, at the boundary of Topley Moor (Eastern Moors Partnership) and Blacka Moor (Sheffield Wildlife Trust), it is proposed to create a scrubby margin to provide a more graded edge between the woodland of Strawberry Lee Plantations and the moorland. This will be planned between the two organisations, and may be delivered together. The proposed 'Operational Group' outlined above will also help in building good joint working and communication between the different teams working in the landscape.</p> <p>The Partnership has also worked hard to achieve a master plan that is both an accessible and an usable document. We have also tried to ensure the document is not too large. This led to a decision to</p>	<p>It is planned to include an additional map to the masterplan that clearly indicates the current primary rights of way routes into and across the Sheffield Moors now, and the proposed strategic network in 15 years.</p> <p>Figures 8 and 9 will be re-designed to improve their value in communicating proposed habitat management and restoration, as well as the links to the surrounding landscape</p>

**THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>combine some of the aspirations together on one map (for example, woodland, grasslands and other habitats within Map 8b). The ownership boundaries are shown on our base maps but the outcomes/tasks for the strategic objectives are not shown in geographic isolation. In some regards isolating a habitat such as woodland from grassland loses some of the impact we are trying to achieve through a landscape scale approach. It is acknowledged that particularly with regard to the PROW network there would be a benefit to being able to see the whole network separated from other recreational issues.</p>	
3.5.6	<p>It would be useful to know which of the key actions are planned and which are aspirational</p>	<p>The master plan sets out an aspirational vision along with key long term objectives. By definition, those tasks that are listed for delivery in the first 5 years are planned activity. After the first years, a new 5 year programme of planned activity will be developed.</p>	None proposed
3.5.7	<p>It would be good practice to include key actions for ALL the Strategic Outcomes</p>	<p>Acknowledged that all strategic objectives need some key actions or statement for the first 5 years, even if it is to simply state that no specific work is planned around this objective prior to 2018.</p>	<p>Key actions in the next five years will be added to all Strategic Objectives, unless otherwise stated that no specific action is required prior to 2018</p>

**THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.5.8	With respect to Strategic Outcome 5.1, how can the landscape be wild <u>and</u> open?	<p>The use of the word “wild” refers to the visitor experience of the moorland landscape and not to an absence of management.</p> <p>The habitats which occur on the Sheffield Moors are largely the result of human activity, albeit centuries ago. For example, the upland heaths are the result of historic clearance of natural forest thousands of years ago, followed by burning and grazing. The open ground habitats these processes created now support many rare and unique species and their importance is recognised by the national and international conservations designations for the majority of the Sheffield Moors and key species that are supported by the landscape. At the same time, the maintenance of these habitats today does require some degree of habitat intervention. Ideally, this should be light touch, for example, extensive grazing using both wild animals (red deer, rabbits, hares) and hardy breed livestock. In effect what is proposed in the masterplan continues the existing direction of travel away from high density grazing supported by past subsidy regimes, towards more extensive grazing to encourage a ‘wilder’ more diverse landscape and habitats.</p> <p>At the same time, various Strategic Outcomes in the draft plan, such as 3.1</p>	None proposed

**THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.5.9	With respect to Strategic Outcome 5.1, what is the landscape's historic character and which historic period is being referred to?	<p>'Conservation and enhancement of the landscape' and 5.1 'The wild and open nature of the landscape is protected', highlight a desire from the SMP to respect the character of the area. This will be delivered in a number of other ways, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally restricting visitor information and interpretative signage to the entrances into the landscape</li> <li>• Using materials in any path improvements that are in keeping with the local geology</li> <li>• Restricting inappropriate recreational activities</li> </ul>	None proposed

**THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.5.10	With respect to Strategic Outcome 5.1, how do you define a feeling of wilderness?	needs of humans, mainly as rough grazing, since prehistoric times leaving soils undisturbed, which explains why so much from prehistory has survived. Well preserved archaeological remains of Bronze Age and Iron Age settlements and ritual monuments are common, and located extensively across the Sheffield Moors. These are a nationally important resource, with over 40 'Scheduled Monuments' across the landscape.  The term "wilderness" in Outcome 5.1 is used to articulate the sense of experience that people can feel when they visit the Sheffield Moors. This feeling will vary for individuals but it is clear that people value the Sheffield Moors for its wild and open nature.	None proposed
3.5.11	That learning from best practice elsewhere is applied where possible to encourage a more creative approach to proposals for the future	The SMP's vision is to deliver exemplar upland management and to be held up as an example of best practice nationally. At the same time it is quite right to acknowledge that we can learn from others. Strategic Outcome 5.3 specifically references this. Strategic Outcome 5.4 could reference the use of best practice from outside the SMP partnership as part of the review process.	The wording of Strategic Outcome 5.4 will be changed to reference external best practice being used as part of the 5 year review process



**THEME: DELIVERING THE MASTERPLAN**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.5.12	How will the key actions be measured and monitored?	The SMP Master plan aims to provide a high level framework to guide the individual management plans of the respective land owners/managers. It is expected that it will be at Management Plan level that the key monitoring and evaluation will take place. However, it is acknowledged that an evaluation framework is needed for the master plan as a whole, and delivery of the 'key actions' will be monitored by the SMP Steering Group, and through a review of progress each year	None proposed, but more formal monitoring and evaluation process will be developed by the SMP Steering Group during 2013.
B.5.13	What is meant by the 'stakeholders' and is anyone excluded?	<p>"Stakeholders" refers to individuals, groups and organisations that have a specific interest in the SMP area.</p> <p>It is not envisaged that the same volume of consultation would be completed for the review as has been completed for the initial master plan. However, there is a commitment to ensure all those that have commented as part of the master plan production will also have the opportunity to take part in the review process.</p> <p>As has been the case with the development of the masterplan to date, no one would be excluded from the review process.</p>	None proposed

## 3.6 The Draft Vision

Draft Vision			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.6.1	Support for the draft vision for the Sheffield	Thank You	None proposed
3.6.2	No, support not given for the draft Vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of management jargon</li> <li>• Its purpose seems to be to serve the interests if the conservation groups and charities</li> </ul>	The SMP will be revising the vision to make it more 'plain english'.  The draft Vision was informed by the public engagement that took place during 2012. The Vision sets out an aspiration for ALL organisations and individuals with an interest in the Sheffield Moors to work together to care for the landscape and the many benefits it brings.	To revise the language used in the vision to make in more 'plain english'
3.6.3	That the Sheffield Moors lie within a larger landscape including neighbours such as the Chatsworth Estate, and that the plan should be more explicit about how its vision integrates into the vision of bodies like the PDNPA and Natural England	The draft masterplan has been informed by the PDNPA and Natural England, as members of the SMP. Figure 3 helps to illustrate the connection to wider strategic policy locally and nationally.  However, it is agreed that the masterplan could be more explicit about where and how it sits within a wider landscape	The wider landscape context of the Sheffield Moors will be made more explicit in the masterplan
3.6.4	That the landscape should not be fossilised, and that while honouring our heritage, to be bold in shaping the landscape of the future	Agreed. The vision aspires to do this.	None proposed
3.6.5	No changes are needed to improve the draft vision	Thank you for your support	None proposed
3.6.6	Supportive of the vision	Thank you for your support	None proposed

3.6.7	That the vision is one that moves away from the organisational boundaries of individual sites, and aims to maximise public benefits	Agreed. One of the key drivers of the masterplan is to consider the Sheffield Moors at a 'landscape scale' and to plan strategically on that basis.  Maximising public benefits is a key part of the vision	The vision will be revised to emphasise the landscape scale approach proposed
3.6.8	That the vision should be clearer on what the Sheffield Moors will look like in the future	Agreed	The vision will be revised to make it clearer what the landscape could look like in 2028
3.6.9	Suggested the Vision is re-worded to include greater emphasis on community collaboration	The draft vision and vision statement does strongly emphasise the critical role of the community in helping to look after and care for the Sheffield Moors. The SMP want to help in encouraging more involvement, for example through more volunteering.	None proposed.
3.6.10	The vision should include reference to the significant geological interests of the Sheffield Moors	Agreed	The wording of the vision will be amended to specifically reference the geology
3.6.11	That the vision should not reference the Sheffield Moors as a working landscape and should be an opportunity to allow natural processes to determine the nature of the landscape and wildlife within it.	Please refer to the SMP Response to Key Issue 3.3.24 above	None proposed
3.6.12	That the vision should use language that is clearly understood by the public	Please refer to the SMP Response to Key Issue 3.6.2 above	As for Key Issue 3.6.2 above

3.6.13	Greater weight should be given to sustainable land management and the economy in the vision	<p>The draft masterplan does refer to economically viable and environmentally sustainable farm businesses, and the importance of the landscape in helping to support the local economy (through tourism, day visits, sustainable natural products from land management, etc). However, it is recognised that other sources of funding over and above public monies should be accessed to help support the management and care of the Sheffield Moors. Ambitions within the plan, such as the proposal to trial a 'visitor payback scheme' with local businesses, is one way we are hoping to explore new mechanisms that help support the management of the area.</p>	None proposed
--------	---	---	---------------

## 3.7 Draft masterplan appendices

Draft masterplan appendices			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.7.1	Suggested additional stakeholders in Appendix 1 of the masterplan	Agreed	Appendix 1 will be amended to include reference to the additional stakeholders highlighted
3.7.2	Suggested rewording of parts of Appendix 2 of the draft masterplan	Agreed	The suggested re-wording of part of Appendix 2 will be actioned, and consideration given to including the information within Appendix 2 earlier in the main masterplan document
3.7.3	That Appendix 2, in particular the section of Sustainable Land Management, does not fully reflect the full range of view expressed at the public workshops in Feb-April 2012. The same could be said for the Strategic Outcomes.	Disagreed. Appendix 2, Sustainable Land Management is intended as a summary of the key issues that emerged during the public workshops. It does reference the view that livestock could be removed from some areas to see how the landscape would change.  Overall, the Strategic Outcomes have been informed by the public engagement workshops and the views of statutory bodies and other stakeholders. Where appropriate, these will be revised before the plan is finalised (as described in Sections 3.1-3.5 above).	None proposed

3.7.4	Suggested additions to the 'Glossary of Terms'	Agreed	The suggested additions to the Glossary of Terms will be added
-------	--	--------	--

## 3.8 Draft masterplan maps

Draft masterplan maps			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.8.1	Suggested additional map showing public transport routes and stops	Thank you for this suggestion. It is not the role of the Sheffield Moors masterplan to provide detailed maps of the public transport network. However, a map that shows the current recreational infrastructure of the Sheffield Moors and nearby transport hubs will be added to the masterplan	Include an additional map indicating the current recreational infrastructure and transport hubs
3.8.2	Various suggested additions, improvements and clarifications to a number of the draft masterplan maps	Thank you for these suggested additions and improvements, and detailed clarifications.  These will be dealt with on a map by map basis as appropriate	To be incorporated on a map by map basis as appropriate

### 3.9 Draft masterplan structure

Draft masterplan structure			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.9.1	Suggestion that the Introduction to the masterplan better recognises the importance of the Sheffield Moors to the people of Sheffield, as well as how its role – from private to public land - has evolved over time	Agreed that the importance of the Sheffield Moors to the people of Sheffield should be more greatly emphasised	Greater emphasis on the historic links between the people of Sheffield, including the changing use and access rights to this landscape, will be included in the masterplan
3.9.2	Suggestion that the 'What Makes the Sheffield Moors so important' section be expanded to include more of the non-statutory values, especially those associated with access and recreation	Thank you for your suggestion. Consideration to expand this section in the way suggested will be given when the plan is being finalised	To consider expanding the section titled 'What Makes the Sheffield Moors so Important' to include more on the non-statutory values and importance of the area
3.9.3	Correct spelling on Sandford Principle required	Thank you. This correction will be made	Correct the spelling of the Sandford Principle
3.9.4	Suggestion that the titles of the section called 'Why do this' be changed to 'What are we doing this for?'	The SMP Steering Group will consider this suggestion	The proposed re-wording will be considered
3.9.5	Suggestion that the titles of the Strategic Outcomes be added to the Key Actions table to improve understanding	Agreed	To include the titles of the Strategic Outcomes in the Key Actions table
3.9.6	Can the 'key actions' table be presented as 'landscape'?	Agreed.	To present the 'Key Actions' table in landscape view



3.9.7	Suggestion that references are included at the bottom of each relevant page rather than the end of each chapter	Thank you for your suggestion. It has been decided to include all references in the Appendices, so they are grouped together in one place.	All references to be included in the Appendices
-------	---	--	---

### 3.10 Any other comments

Any other comments			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.10.1	Support for the draft masterplan	Thank you	None proposed
3.10.2	That the development of the plan and the consultation are a missed opportunity, and that the process has been led by the organisations within the Sheffield Moors Partnership rather than the public	<p>The SMP has facilitated a variety of mechanisms to involve stakeholders in developing the draft masterplan, for example the 'Ideas gathering workshops held in February to April 2012, as well as a consultation questionnaire in autumn 2012, complimented by 15 'roadshows' in the landscape to help in reaching a wide range of people who come to enjoy the Sheffield Moors.</p> <p>At the same time, management of the Sheffield Moors is also informed by the statutory protection and other designations that affect the landscape, such as National Park status.</p> <p>Wherever possible, the SMP has taken on board the views and suggestions of stakeholders, and where this has not been possible, this has explained through this document.</p> <p>The SMP will continue to engage with stakeholders as the masterplan moves to implementation</p>	None proposed

## Any other comments

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.10.3	That the language used within the masterplan is misleading and woolly	The SMP is happy to look at the text of the draft masterplan and wherever possible make it more 'plain english', and removing any unnecessary jargon	To make the final version of the masterplan 'plain English' wherever possible
3.10.4	That the plan should make explicit reference to the Natural England Dark Peak National Character Area.	Agreed.	To amend the masterplan, so that the Natural England Dark Peak National Character Area will be explicitly referenced
3.10.5	That there has not been enough done to raise awareness of the masterplan proposals to tenants and private landowners in the Redmires and Brown Edge area	The SMP worked hard to promote the masterplanning process as widely as possible through a variety of means but we recognise that not everyone will have been reached.  At the same time, the masterplan is a strategic document, and very much sets out a vision for the future of the area. Any proposals that affect land management will be subject to stakeholder engagement and consultation as more detailed planning starts to take shape.	As stated in relation to Key Issue 3.2.16, the text of the masterplan will be strengthened to emphasise the need for further stakeholder engagement and consultation (including tenants) in relevant proposals, such as changes to the public rights of way network
3.10.6	That the public have had little opportunity to question partners on the masterplan, and that the consultation was poorly promoted	The consultation was promoted through a wide variety of means including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over a 100 posters in and around the Sheffield Moors, nearby villages, and the City of Sheffield</li> <li>Press coverage in local press</li> <li>A dedicated website</li> <li>Through the 'roadshows' held in September and October 2012, which</li> </ul>	None proposed

<b>Any other comments</b>			
<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Summary of key issue from the comments</b>	<b>SMP Response</b>	<b>Changes required to the masterplan</b>
3.10.7	Questioning whether stakeholders opinions will be fully taken into account in future decision making	<p>reached nearly 700 people</p> <p>At each stage of the process of developing the masterplan, the partners have been happy to answer questions, either verbally and/or in writing.</p> <p>The SMP has facilitated a variety of mechanisms to involve stakeholders in developing the draft masterplan, for example the 'Ideas gathering workshops held in February to April 2012'.</p> <p>At the same time, management of the Sheffield Moors is also informed by the statutory protection and other designations that affect the landscape, such as National Park status.</p> <p>Wherever possible, the SMP has taken on board the views and suggestions of stakeholders, and where this has not been possible, this has explained through this document.</p> <p>The SMP will continue to engage with stakeholders as the masterplan moves to implementation</p>	None proposed

## Any other comments

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.10.8	That the masterplan will inhibit the freedom of user groups 'to go their own way'	<p>The Sheffield Moors masterplan sets out a long-term vision for the area, and a range of proposed 'key actions' to help deliver that vision over the next 15 years. The SMP would be very happy to hear from groups who want to get more involved in helping to deliver that vision or who have other questions about how the area is managed, etc.</p> <p>Ultimately, visitors and users groups have a range of rights of access to the Sheffield Moors, for example under the CROW Act 2000. At the same time, recreational and other activities should be enjoyed in ways that do not conflict with the various conservation interests and other special importance of what is a protected and designated landscape.</p>	None proposed
3.10.9	What can be done to ensure the Masterplan remains accountable to the public?	<p>The masterplan was developed by the Sheffield Moors Partnership following public and other engagement workshops.</p> <p>The delivery of the masterplan will be monitored through the SMP Steering Group, and the progress of the masterplan will be fully reviewed every five years against planned delivery, with the involvement and input of stakeholders.</p> <p>Both Sheffield City Council and the Peak</p>	None proposed

**Any other comments**

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>District National Park Authority are local authorities, and Officers are ultimately accountable to their Executive Management Teams, and their elected Members, who in turn are accountable to their local communities. The National Trust is a charity, governed by its Council and Trustees, who are accountable to the Trust's membership. Sheffield Wildlife Trust is a charity governed by its Board of Trustees, and accountable to its membership. The RSPB is also a charity. Its governing body is the RSPB Council, whose members are elected by the RSPB membership each year. Natural England is the government's advisor on the natural environment. NE is accountable to Government, who in turn are accountable to the electorate. In addition, there are a variety of existing forums covering parts of the Sheffield Moors – such as the Stanage Forum (led by the Peak District National Park Authority), the Blacka Moor Reserve Advisory Group (led by Sheffield Wildlife Trust), and the Eastern Moors Stakeholder Forum (led by the Eastern Moors Partnership) - which provide an opportunity for groups representing access, wildlife and cultural heritage interests, to influence and input into site management etc.</p>	

## Any other comments

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.10.10	Concern about whether consultation exercises will have reached a fair representation of the different interest groups and people who visit the Sheffield Moors	<p>The SMP have engaged with the community in a variety of means – including through public workshops, ‘roadshows’ in the landscape, and a web-based consultation questionnaire – meeting people with a wide variety of perspectives about the Sheffield Moors. The SMP have also worked hard to contact the wide range of groups that represent wildlife, geological, access and recreation, and archaeological interests in the Sheffield Moors, and this is reflected in the breadth of organisations that have responded to the consultation.</p> <p>At the same time, we recognise that we will only have engaged a proportion of those that visit and enjoy the Sheffield Moors.</p> <p>As such, going forward one of the Strategic Outcomes of the masterplan is that ‘People and community involvement is at the heart of all activities’. As this implies, the SMP will continue to engage and consult with stakeholders as individual key actions within the masterplan start to be worked up and implementation begins.</p>	None proposed
3.10.11	Why isn't Moors for the Future one of the Sheffield Moors partners?	<p>The Moors for the Future Partnership (MFFP) is a partnership organisation consisting of the following project partners: Peak District National</p>	None proposed

Any other comments			
Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
		<p>Park Authority, National Trust, Natural England, United Utilities, Severn Trent Water, Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water, Derbyshire County Council and RSPB.</p> <p>Its primary aims are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To raise awareness of why the moors are valuable and to encourage responsible use and care of the landscape</li> <li>• To restore and conserve important recreational and natural moorland resources</li> <li>• To develop expertise on how to protect and manage the moors sustainably</li> </ul> <p>Whilst the masterplan for the Sheffield Moors has been informed in part by the lessons learnt from the major moorland restoration work undertaken through the MFFP, the MFFP is not set up as a land manager as such, and has no legal interest in the land within the Sheffield Moors.</p>	



## Any other comments

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.10.12	Suggested greater use of on-line methods of communication such as a joint website	<p>At present the SMP has developed a dedicated webpage at: <a href="http://www.sheffieldmoors.co.uk">www.sheffieldmoors.co.uk</a></p> <p>as a focus for information in relation to the masterplan. This also has links to each of the partners websites, where more detailed information can be found on specific areas within the Sheffield Moors. In time, the partners may decide to use the Sheffield Moors website to directly promote the activities and events of all the partners, but at present the approach outlined above will be followed.</p>	None proposed at present.
3.10.13	Concern that there may be a general lack of awareness and training of staff who are involved in the management of the Sheffield Moors	<p>Each of the partners within the SMP takes its responsibility for managing what is a heavily designated and protected landscape seriously, striving to employ staff with the appropriate skills, knowledge and experience. Where appropriate, this is complemented by training and other personal development to maintain and where appropriate maintain their competency.</p>	None proposed
3.10.14	Why is the area referred to as the 'Sheffield' Moors when a large part of them lie in Derbyshire?	<p>The name 'Sheffield Moors' comes from a recognition that many of the visitors that come to enjoy the moors are from the Sheffield area, and linked to this, the very close proximity of the landscape to what is England's fourth largest City.</p>	None proposed

## Any other comments

Reference Number	Summary of key issue from the comments	SMP Response	Changes required to the masterplan
3.10.15	Is the Sheffield Moors a campaign?	At the same, the SMP fully recognise the importance of the moors to the people of Derbyshire and visitors from further afield. No. The Sheffield Moors is way of looking at the various moorlands as a single landscape, that encourages the various land managers and others with a interest to deliver a more co-ordinated and joined up approach to their management and future that maximises their public benefits	None proposed
B.10.16	That the SMP is another layer of bureaucracy	Not agreed. The SMP helps to facilitate a joined up approach to the care and management of the Sheffield Moors as a whole, but the responsibility for the management of each individual 'site', for example Longshaw, remains with the landowner/land manager. In the case of Longshaw, this is the National Trust.  The SMP has been deliberately developed with minimal bureaucracy, and by working more closely the partners can secure additional benefits such as shared best practice, resolving shared issues together, and securing additional resources, for example, the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area programme. This programme has attracted £400k for the Sheffield Moors to help resource habitat and access improvements over the next two years.	None proposed



This page is intentionally left blank