

APPENDIX 3

PRTT March 2010
Item 4 BJT 20 minutes

Overview of Consultation Responses to Preferred Approaches

For members to note some of the key responses to the recent consultation, flagging up particularly challenging areas as we draft our final version of the plan for submission.

The idea here is that members note these responses and raise any particular issues as to the manner in which the emerging plan may deal with them.

There is insufficient time at the meeting to deal with all issues which may occur, so at the meeting members are asked to raise issues of particular concern. Other matters of less concern can be dealt with individually by officers after the meeting.

Issues connected with Settlement Strategy, Enhancement Exceptions and Renewable Energy are dealt with as part of item 5 on this agenda.

Members may wish to remind themselves of the document which was the subject of the preferred options consultation. This is available from the link below in either a summarised or full length form.

<http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/index/looking-after/plansandpolicies/ldf/ldfconsultation.htm>

General Spatial Policies

- Overall support for securing National Park purposes through spatial policy
- Support for position on major development but need to better reflect the tests in national policy
- Support for embedding principles on sustainable development, but more thought needed on how to address climate change at strategic level
- Strong support to embed landscape strategy into the Core Strategy
- Mixed views on the settlement strategy with preference expressed by PPPF and some parishes for criteria only approach, with no list. (Note this is dealt with specifically in Item 5)
- Feeling that category A and B approach should be removed to remove confusion about the role of settlements and create more flexibility.
- Several requests by parishes to alter the assumption about growth, with more flexibility in some cases and more constraint in others, with a plea from some to restrict new build development in that parish
- Concern expressed for not explicitly mentioning all other small settlements
- Cautious support for the approach to planning gain, welcoming reflection of local priorities, but concern that the approach isn't sufficiently well defined.

Landscapes and Conservation

- Overall support for the principles on natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage with concern about the level of detail with a view that much could move to development management policy

Visiting and Enjoying

- Strong support for the approach with suggestion that some of the content could be in supporting text.
- Good recognition of cross-boundary issues
- Some comments seeking greater flexibility for recreation and tourism uses in countryside locations

Climate Change

- Overall support for embedding the energy hierarchy and higher sustainable construction standards into all new development
- More guidance sought on sustainable design and construction techniques in SPD with concern to balance 'new' sustainable development with the historic built environment and landscape of the PDNP. Exemplar schemes in sustainable design appropriate to the PDNP could point the way for the future.
- Overall support for the approach to renewables with requests for greater definition of terms, e.g. small scale or appropriate scale
- Comments seek better linkage between policy managing impact of climate change on land use, biodiversity, with landscape policies
- General support for policy on agricultural and domestic waste with concerns related to HGV trips, the definition of "community" scale, and the desire to be more supportive of community level Anaerobic Digestion
- Overall support for approach to dealing with construction and demolition waste

Homes and Communities

- Strong support for the role of the National Park in providing affordable housing
- Some request more opportunity for open market housing, recognising the value of enhancement projects as opportunities to gain further affordable units through cross subsidy
- Strong support for the scale of housing delivery to be within the capacity of the National Park, respecting its character
- Strong overall support for the methods for delivering affordable housing with some uncertainty about the role of buy-back
- Overall support for policies supporting the needs of different groups and types of tenure with some objection to the limited provision for travellers, and suggestion that some needs warrant separate policies, e.g. for care homes
- Strong support for housing those employed in agriculture, forestry and other rural enterprises
- Overall support for seeking greater provision of affordable housing through enhancement schemes, but concern as to the viability of this approach and mixed views on the scope for market housing overall, with some viewing it as necessary to achieve appropriate enhancement and delivery of affordable homes and others fundamentally against market housing in favour of locally needed homes
- Overall support for dealing with sites on a case by case basis rather than allocation with the caveat that a priority action plan of preferred sites should be considered linked to public funding and delivery.
- Concern for the scope for community facilities in smaller villages and some calling for stronger policy to resist the loss of community facilities
- Mixed response to the approach to retail provision, with some seeking greater opportunity in countryside locations, e.g. linked to recreation facilities

Economy

- General support for the approach to business development in the countryside with some pleased by the more flexible approach and others looking for policy to go even further
- General support for the approach to business development in villages although some feeling that the approach is too restrictive
- Strong support to safeguarding existing employment land with strong feeling the town and village employment space should be protected from other uses to give people access to central facilities
- General support for approach to holiday accommodation with some concerns that these uses should not restrict other important objectives for affordable housing, or simply to seek the effective conservation of a traditional building
- Mixed response to the approach to caravan and camping with some only wanting small sites and affordable camping and others seeking opportunities for larger sites (chalet and lodge parks) which may be acceptable in some locations

Minerals

- The objective of reducing mineral activity in the PDNP needs explicit reference
- Feeling that no open cast mining should be permitted.
- More flexibility should be allowed in Minerals policy to better reflect MSP 1 which allows for mineral extraction in National Parks in 'exceptional circumstances'.
- A socio-economic impact report for the PDNP should be produced underlining the impact of mineral plant closures.
- A reliance on external mineral activity in Derbyshire to meet PDNP demand will detract from what is an integral economic activity of the Park and will increase cross park HGV use.
- Hope Valley Works should be regarded in a more positive light as a central contributor to the local economy and a responsible working partner. More emphasis should be placed on making the works environmentally sustainable and limiting operation to undergrounding rather than opposition.
- The increasing restriction of mineral activity in the PDNP must consider potentially negative impacts this may inflict on surrounding sites (for example Cauldon in the Staffordshire Moorlands)
- Support opposition to opencast mining. The policy could go further by introducing an aggregates levy justified by the exceptional location of the National Park.
- Concern that underground mining is not the most efficient way of extracting fluorspar. Flexibility needed in case underground reserves are depleted/become inefficient to work. May mean allowing opencast.
- Policy doesn't recognise that opencast sites can return to the landscape with appropriate phasing work.
- Support for distinction made between building/roofing stone and larger aggregate activities.
- Local building/roofing works, such as that at Stanton Moor, should be viewed as an economic and strategic asset with a strong national reputation for use inside and outside the PDNP
- Conservation policies will not be sustainable if local building/roofing quarries not supported. The policy is too restrictive threatening local buildings and buildings of regional/national importance
- Safeguarding needs a broader remit with greater emphasis on future contingencies, e.g. coal as a potential future energy source or stone needed to conserve buildings within and outside the PDNP.
- A clear criteria explaining how sites are chosen for safeguarding should be given in MIN 7.
- Very strong support for policy on restoration with suggestion it should go further in making restoration of sites an essential planning application pre-requisite.

Traffic, Travel and Accessibility

- Concern over scope of policy. Should LDF go beyond land use policy for the delivery of spatial aims?
- Concern over the legality of opposing transport developments outside the PDNP.
- Travel Plans should only be made necessary for major transport proposals
- More attention should be paid to the reduction of harm through signage, etc and to retaining 'rural' character of smaller roads
- The lack of support for Bakewell relief road is a lost chance to reduce the number of cars in the town but not fiercely challenged elsewhere
- The settlement strategy needs to be more closely related to transport service provision
- The re-opening of the Woodhead railway would reduce the net levels of car use in the PDNP
- No rail development proposals should be restricted
- Feeling by some that road developments are needed for future economic growth around the NP
- Limiting car use may have a detrimental impact on businesses and restrict accessibility of the PDNP
- General support for Managing demand for car and coach parks, for freight transport and for air travel, against their impact on the valued characteristics of the National Park