

Peak District National Park Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Report

The Peak District National Park Authority made a commitment within the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011) to bring forward guidance on the design of transport infrastructure within the National Park¹. The development of the Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document is seen as the fulfilment of this commitment.

The development of the Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document commenced in 2016 with Arcus Consulting being awarded a contract to bring forward a document to its statutory public consultation stage. Prior to the delivery of this consultation version, Arcus contacted a range of stakeholders, prior to holding a workshop with statutory and stakeholder bodies in September of 2016.

Feedback from the workshop was used to produce a document that underwent an informal stakeholder consultation process in the Autumn / Winter of 2016. Feedback from a wide range of internal and external stakeholders was used to further develop the document, resulting in a Consultation Draft which was published in November 2017. This Consultation Draft version underwent a public consultation from November 2017 through to January 2018.

Following the public consultation event, the National Park Authority held a further stakeholder event in May 2018.

Public Consultation

The public consultation prompted responses from 42 individuals or organisations, with a total of 417 separate comments or responses. The comments received varied from the identification of spelling mistakes, through to objections to specific areas of the Design Guide including text, photographs or individual photographs.

The public consultation and our response to it forms the bulk of this report, which identifies changes made to the document as a result of comments received. However, it should be noted that these changes also reflect comments received as part of the stakeholder event in May 2018, following the public consultation.

In conducting the public consultation, the National Park Authority designed a questionnaire to gather views on the Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, its legibility and its ability to guide delivery. The questions provided related to the specific chapters of the document, however, respondents to the consultation were able to comment directly on any part of the document. This document deals with both the responses to the questionnaire and the wider comments that were received. For each chapter, we will cover the questions asked and the responses received along with any additional comments. It should be noted, that of the 42 separate respondents, only seven replied to the questionnaire, with the majority preferring to provide specific or general comments on the document as a whole.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Question 1. Do you think that the role of the Supplementary Planning Document is clearly explained (Yes or No)?

¹ Paragraph 15.25, Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011)
https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/141215/LDF-CoreStrategyFinal.pdf

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to provide information as to what was missing from the document.

- There were six responses to this question, with all six respondents indicating that they thought that the role of the document was clearly explained.

All additional comments received were in relation to typographical errors or points of clarity within Chapter 1, and all were incorporated within the current version of the document.

Chapter 2 – Why produce a Transport Design SPD?

Question 2. Do you agree with the scope and objectives of the Transport Design Guide (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to provide information as to what was missing from the document.

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they agreed with the role of the document.
- The sixth respondent indicated that they supported the objectives, but wished to see further clarity with regard to the 'Park', 'Place' and 'Element' approach. We believe that this clarity is now provided within 'Chapter 1 Why produce a transport design SPD?' of the revised document.

Question 3. Do you understand the Park, Place, Element approach as described in the document (Yes or No)?

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they understand the 'Park', 'Place' and 'Element' approach. One respondent indicated that they did not. We believe that the additional clarity provided within 'Chapter 1 Why produce a transport design SPD?' of the revised document, addresses this concern.

All additional comments received were in relation to typographical errors or points of clarity within Chapter 2, and all were incorporated within the current version of the document.

Chapter 3 – What is the legislative and policy context?

Question 4. Do you agree that all of the relevant legislative and policy areas are covered (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to provide information as to legislative and policy areas were missing from the document.

- There were six responses to this question, with three respondents indicating that they thought that all of the legislative and policy context was covered. Of the remainder, one indicated that they had nothing further to add.
- One respondent questioned whether Section 62 of the Environment Act was sufficiently covered. Paragraphs 2.3 to 2.7 of 'Chapter 2 Legislative and policy context?' of the revised document provide a detailed explanation of Section 62 of the Environment Act and the duties which it proscribes.
- One respondent suggested that the chapter should be strengthened by making specific reference to the UK Wildlife Legislation including The Wildlife and Countryside Act and The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations. Reference to both the Act and

regulations is provided within paragraphs 2.8 to 2.11 of '*Chapter 2 Legislative and policy context?*' within the revised document.

All additional comments received were in relation to typographical errors or points of clarity within Chapter 3. All were incorporated within the current version of the document.

Chapter 4 – Transport Infrastructure in the National Park

Question 5. Does this chapter cover all of the relevant elements of transport infrastructure within the National Park (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered '*no*', they were encouraged to provide information as to which types of transport infrastructure were missing from the document.

- There were seven responses to this question, with only three respondents indicating that they thought that all of the relevant types of transport infrastructure were covered.
- Three respondents indicated that they thought that public transport and sustainable transport options were not adequately covered within the chapter. We have made changes to address this issue. Paragraphs 3.15 to 3.23 within '*Chapter 3 Transport infrastructure within the National Park*', discuss rail and public transport infrastructure plus tracks and trails. In addition, '*Chapter 12 Design Guidance Elements – Public Transport Infrastructure*' offers specific guidance with regard to bus and rail public transport infrastructure.
- One respondent highlighted that Grindleford had been omitted from the list of National Park Stations, and that no reference was made to use of Rowsley Station by Peak Rail. These errors have been addressed within paragraph 3.15 and footnote 4 of '*Chapter 3 Transport infrastructure within the National Park*'.
- One respondent highlighted the need for sections on particular types of infrastructure. This requirement is now addressed within Chapters 7 to 14 on '**Elements**' of transport infrastructure.

All additional comments received were in relation to typographical errors or points of clarity within Chapter 4. All were incorporated within the current version of the document.

Chapter 5 – The special qualities and characteristics of the National Park

Question 6. Are the special qualities and characteristics of the National Park adequately reflected within this chapter (Yes or No)?

During the period between the public consultation and the development of this version of the document, the Peak District National Park Authority led a review of the Peak District National Park Management Plan. Part of the review included a revision of the special qualities of the National Park. These seven special qualities are reflected in '*Chapter 4 The special qualities and characteristics which influence design response*' of the revised document.

- There were six responses to this question, with four respondents indicating that they thought that the special qualities and characteristics of the National Park were adequately reflected.
- One respondent indicated that they thought that public transport and sustainable transport infrastructure were not adequately covered within the chapter. We believe that this is now covered by paragraph 4.12 within '*Chapter 4 The special qualities and characteristics which influence design response*' of the revised document.

- One respondent suggested that the chapter did not give sufficient emphasis to the UK Wildlife Legislation including The Wildlife and Countryside Act and The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations. Reference to both the Act and regulations is provided within paragraphs 2.8 to 2.11 of '*Chapter 2 Legislative and policy context?*' within the revised document. We believe that this is the appropriate place for this guidance rather than '*Chapter 4 The special qualities and characteristics which influence design response*'.

General comments received on Chapter 5 included typographical errors and points of clarity, which have been addressed in the current document. In addition, we received the following comment: -

- One respondent suggested that the special qualities of the National Park should be incorporated into the chapter, rather than added as an appendix. This approach has been undertaken with a description of the seven special qualities being provided at paragraph 4.5 of '*Chapter 4 The special qualities and characteristics which influence design response*'.

Chapter 6 – Design Guidance: Park

Question 7. Does this chapter fully explain how the design of transport infrastructure at a Park-wide level will work (Yes or No)?

- There were six responses to this question, with four respondents indicating that they thought that the chapter did fully explain how the advocated approach works.
- One respondent highlighted the need for the guidance to take account of transport infrastructure being accessible for all. This approach is given weight within paragraph 7.11 of '*Chapter 7 Design guidance elements – overarching principles*'. This approach is then repeated throughout the following Chapters 7 to 14 on infrastructure Elements.
- One respondent suggested that the chapter was limited in scope and focussed on way-finding. We have revised the chapter in light of these comments in order to draw in more context in relation to the Park-wide approach. Whilst '*Chapter 5 Design guidance: Park (including gateways & wayfinding)*' still deals with gateways and wayfinding, it now provides further guidance on our approach.
- There was concern expressed in relation to the millstone gateway feature, from those who thought that the context of the chapter suggested a move away from the use of this feature. This is not the case. However, the chapter does give scope for gateway features that are variable across the National Park dependent on location, setting and context. For example, the delivery of gateway features for a settlement should say something about its character or history. A 'one size fits all approach' should be avoided. However, gateway features should be in keeping with their setting. Similarly, they may not be appropriate in all locations.
- Concern was expressed about the guidance in this chapter leading to a proliferation in signage. It should be noted that overall, the SPD aims to encourage a minimalistic approach to transport infrastructure. In relation to signage, our approach is further clarified within '*Chapter 10 Design guidance elements – road signs and road markings*'.
- One respondent expressed concern with regard to the clarity of the Chapter. We believe that the amendments incorporated within '*Chapter 5 Design guidance: Park (including gateways & wayfinding)*' address these concerns.

Question 8. Is there anything missing from this Chapter in relation to a Park-wide approach (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'yes', they were encouraged to provide information as to which types of transport infrastructure were missing from the document.

- There were six responses to this question, with four respondents indicating that they thought that there were things missing from the chapter. Of these four, two were unable or unwilling to provide examples of what they thought was missing. The remaining two echoed their previous comments in relation to Question 7.
- One respondent highlighted the need for the guidance to take account of transport infrastructure being accessible for all. This approach is given weight within paragraph 7.11 of '*Chapter 7 Design guidance elements – overarching principles*'. This approach is then repeated throughout the following Chapters 7 to 14 on infrastructure Elements.
- There was concern expressed in relation to the millstone gateway feature, from those who thought that the context of the chapter suggested a move away from the use of this feature (see response to Question 7 for further details).

General comments received on Chapter 6 included typographical errors and points of clarity, which have been addressed in the current document. In addition, we received the following comment: -

- There was concern expressed in relation to the millstone gateway feature, from those who thought that the context of the chapter suggested a move away from the use of this feature (see response to Question 7 for further details).

Chapter 7 – Design Guidance: Place

Question 9. Do you think that using the 'Place' approach using landscape character areas of the National Park to guide the approach to transport design is a good one (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to explain why they thought that the 'Place' approach was not a good one.

- There were six responses to this question, with all six respondents indicating that they thought that the approach was a good one. However, three respondents offered suggestions to either improve the chapter or to highlight things that they believed were missing from the chapter.
- One respondent felt that 'accessibility for all' was missing from the chapter. This approach is now given weight within paragraph 7.11 of '*Chapter 7 Design guidance elements – overarching principles*'. This approach is then repeated throughout the following Chapters 8 to 12 on infrastructure Elements.
- One respondent indicated that they thought that public transport and sustainable transport infrastructure were not adequately covered within the chapter. We believe that this is now covered by paragraph 4.12 within '*Chapter 4 The special qualities and characteristics which influence design response*' of the revised document. In addition, sustainable means of travel are covered by the Design Guidance: Elements, Chapter 7 to 14.
- Concern was expressed about the level of signage clutter within the National Park, with a suggested rationalisation in favour of brown tourist signs, where necessary. In relation to signage, our approach is further clarified within '*Chapter 10 Design guidance elements – road signs and road markings*'.
- One respondent questioned whether there are other aspects of landscape character that vary between Peak District places, e.g. characteristic vegetation, that ought to inform

Place-based design? This is a valid point, but one which we believe is addressed by a landscape character approach.

- One respondent asked the question as to whether in addition to Bakewell, there should be dedicated guidance for other larger settlements, including Hathersage, Castleton, Froggatt or Eyam. We believe that the SPD should work with Conservation Area Appraisals to ensure that the delivery of transport infrastructure is in accordance with the setting of Conservation Areas. This point is now referenced within '*Chapter 7 Design guidance elements – overarching considerations*'.

Question 10. Do you think that using the landscape character areas of the National Park to guide the approach to transport design will work (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to explain why they thought that the 'Place' approach would not work.

- There were six responses to this question, with all six respondents indicating that they thought that the approach would work. However, two respondents offered additional advice which they thought would help to ensure the success of the approach.
- One respondent stated that the chapter should include a clear upfront statement, reiterating the advice that developers should refer to the Peak District's detailed Landscape Strategy and Action Plan. The respondent also suggested that the character and appearance of the built environment (particularly in urban areas) and the 'significance' of a place should also be considerations. We believe that this approach is inherent within the revised version of the document.
- One respondent indicated that the approach should also incorporate biodiversity and geodiversity. An approach which incorporates a commitment to overall net environmental gain as described within '*Chapter 7 Design guidance elements – overarching considerations*' will assist with this.

Question 11. Is this an approach that your organisation would be willing to use (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to explain why their organisation would not be able to use this approach.

- There were five responses to this question, with three respondents indicating that their organisations were willing to use this approach. Of the remaining two, one stated that it was not applicable, as they were a partnership organisation, whilst the other stated that they were unsure how it would apply to them.

General comments received on the Chapter included typographical errors and points of clarity, which have been addressed in the current document. In addition, we received the following comments on Chapter 7: -

- One respondent provided comments in relation to the safety of pedestrians using Bakewell Bridge. '*Chapter 6 Design guidance: Place*' sets the context for Bakewell in relation to the design of transport infrastructure. However, this document is a design guide rather than a delivery document. Whilst it would have a role in influencing any measures that may be brought forward to address the concerns of the respondent, the issue itself falls outside of the specific scope of this document.
- One correspondent suggested that design principles should be incorporated at the start of each chapter, this is being considered for the final designed version of the document.

- One correspondent expressed concern that the approaches within Chapter 7 may have an impact on safety. The SDP is clear that all infrastructure should be designed to be able to perform its intended function. However, this still gives scope within safety parameters and National Guidance to minimise or mitigate visual and other impacts, and in some cases provide enhancement to the National Park and its setting.
- In referring to the section on Bakewell, one respondent made the case for the delivery of a Bakewell bypass. This is outside the scope of this document. However, it should be noted that the safeguarding of the route has been removed from a previously identified route, and a bypass for Bakewell does not feature within the Highway Authority's current plans.
- One respondent expressed support for the points contained within the section on Bakewell.
- One respondent suggested that this Chapter include a direct reference to the Peak District National Park Landscape Strategy and European Landscape Convention Action Plan (2009-2019). This has been incorporated as suggested within '*Chapter 6 Design Guidance: Place*'.
- One respondent suggested that the Design Guide should take account of the possible need for additional speed cameras to be introduced within the National Park. We have incorporated guidance on enforcement cameras within '*Chapter 13 Design guidance elements – enforcement cameras*' of the revised document.
- One respondent suggested that the planting of individual shrubs and trees may assist with the integration of highway infrastructure. We believe that an approach which incorporates a commitment to overall net environmental gain as described within '*Chapter 7 Design guidance elements – overarching considerations*' will assist with this. Similarly, this approach is also advocated within '*Chapter 11 Design guidance elements – public realm and street furniture*'.

Chapter 8 – Design Guidance: Element

Question 12. Do you think that using this approach of drilling down by 'Park' and 'Place' to the individual elements of a scheme is useful (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'no', they were encouraged to explain why they thought that the 'Element' approach was not useful.

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they thought that the approach was useful. The remaining respondent indicated that they didn't really understand the approach.
- One respondent felt that there was a lack of guidance within the chapter prior to the section on the public realm. Chapters 7 to 14 (**Elements**) address this comment, within the revised document.

Question 13. Do you think that there is anything missing from the list of elements provided that should be included (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered 'yes', they were encouraged to explain why they thought that the 'Element' approach was not useful.

- There were six responses to this question, with three respondents indicating that they thought that there were things missing from the '**Elements**' chapter. Of the remaining respondents who answered the question, one gave no additional comment, one didn't know, and one thought that there was nothing missing.

The respondents who were able to identify missing elements provided the following comments: -

- One respondent stated that “*There is a missed opportunity to highlight the importance of sustainable transport routes within this section*” and that “*There is no reference to non-motorised use schemes*”. We believe that these points, and others made in reference to non-motorised transport and ‘access for all’ are now addressed within the Chapters 7 to 14 (**Elements**) of the document.
- One respondent stated that the chapter “*should also include the safety of sustainable transport users*”. This is now addressed within ‘*Chapter 8 Design guidance elements – roads, junctions and access layouts*’; whilst also featuring across Chapters 9 to 13 (**Elements**) of the document.
- One respondent stated that “*Car parks should be accessible to all users including disabled parking bays, cycle racks and hitching rails with mounting blocks. Consideration should be included for horse box parking and coaches*”. This point has been taken into account within ‘*Chapter 9 Design guidance elements – parking*’.
- One respondent highlighted the requirement for the provision of disabled toilet and changing places facilities. Whilst we support this approach, it falls outside of the remit of this document, which deals purely with transport infrastructure.
- One respondent highlighted the need to have regard to statutory sites and enhancement of the environment. This concern is addressed within ‘*Chapter 2 Legislative and policy context?*’ of the revised document.

Question 14. Is the Park, Place, Element approach to designing a transport scheme one that your organisation would be willing to use (Yes or No)?

If respondents answered ‘no’, they were encouraged to explain why their organisation would not be able to use the **Park, Place, Element** approach.

- There were six responses to this question, with three respondents indicating that their organisations were willing to use this approach. Of the remaining three, one stated that they would have regard to the approach, whilst one stated that it was not applicable, as they were a partnership organisation. The remaining respondent stated that they were unsure how it would apply to them.

General comments received on Chapter 8 included typographical errors and points of clarity, which have been addressed in the current document. In addition, we received the following comments:

-

- One respondent suggested that car parks should “*provide a layout that is effective, safe and crime-resistant*”. The same respondent also stated that “*well-designed car parks respond to needs and deliver users to a designated space efficiently. Poor designs can be unclear for users and result in parking on landscape areas, blocking access, abuse of disabled parking and other negative impacts including crime or anti-social behaviour*”. We also received comments about the need for parking areas to be easily visible for users to reduce both crime, and the fear of crime. We believe that ‘*Chapter 9 Design guidance elements – parking*’ now addresses these observations.
- We received comments in relation to the need for the introduction of green infrastructure to be carried out in relation to context of the village that it’s in. There was also the question of whether there is a need to maintain/recreate the historic setting. This approach is considered within ‘*Chapter 11 Design guidance elements – public realm and street furniture*’.

- One respondent identified the tension between providing road signs that need to be visible to road users, with the visual intrusion that they cause, and suggested that this was not resolved within the document. We believe that the minimalist approach suggested within the document as a whole, and in relation to signage, within '*Chapter 10 Design guidance elements – road signs and road markings*' gives scope for the delivery of functional signage, whilst minimising visual impact.
- We received comments suggesting that the guidance is too lengthy and complex. Whilst the document has increased in size as a result of its revision, it now delivers greater clarity by splitting the former elements of this chapter into eight separate chapters, each of which deals with a particular topic area.
- We received comments suggesting that DMRB standards for Stopping Site Distances were not appropriate for all roads, particularly those with a speed limit of 40mph or more, but with low levels of use. The guidance contained within '*Chapter 8 Design guidance elements – roads, junctions and access layouts*' has been adapted accordingly.
- We received comments raising concerns about the use of level shared space schemes in relation to general safety and the impact on those with impairments to their sight. These concerns have been reflected within the revised document.

Chapter 9 – Case Studies

Question 15. Do you think that the case studies provided are useful examples of how new or existing transport infrastructure could be introduced within the National Park (Yes or No)?

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they thought that the case studies were useful. The remaining respondent offered no comment.
- One respondent who stated that the case studies were a good idea, voiced some concerns about the examples. These concerns included; the requirement to include non-motorised users; the inclusion of a stepped bridge as one of the case studies; the inclusion of disabled / cycle / equestrian parking; the inclusion of public transport schemes.

Question 16. Do you think that an ongoing collection of case studies of best practice to accompany the document would be useful (Yes or No)?

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they thought that an ongoing collection of case studies to illustrate best practice would be useful. The remaining respondent offered no comment.

Question 17. Do you have any suggestions for additional accompanying case studies that could be added to the document?

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they didn't have any suggestions. The remaining respondent suggested a scheme to be brought forward around the Damflask Reservoir area.

General comments received on the Chapter included typographical errors and points of clarity, which have been addressed in the current document. In addition, we received the following comments on Chapter 9: -

- In relation to '*Case Study A – Bakewell Town Centre*', whilst, the visual appeal was noted, concern was expressed in relation to feasibility and safety.

- The appropriate highway authority defended a scheme as delivered, which featured in '*Case Study B – Peak Forest, A623 Westbound*'. The respondent also questioned the appropriateness of the alternative approach put forward within the Design Guide. A request was made by the highway authority for the Case Study to be removed from the SPD. The revised SPD no longer contains this Case Study.
- In relation to '*Case Study C – A537 at Ankers Lane Junction*', a signage audit was suggested as a means of dealing with the issue.
- One respondent expressed concern about the design (including materials) of the entrance to the housing development featured within '*Case Study D – Housing Development, Yowlgrave*'
- One respondent expressed disappointment that '*Case Study E – Hathersage Footbridge*' incorporated a stepped design, and that this was being shown as an example of best practice.
- Concern was expressed about the suggested redesign of a bus shelter within '*Case Study F – Fairholmes Car Park*'.

Future approach to case studies

Based on comments received as part of the consultation, the decision has been taken to only incorporate case studies that illustrate best practice within the National Park, rather than showing examples where there has been any contention over the approach taken. Future case studies may reflect designs that are of particular merit, or highlight an approach to partnership working to deliver the most appropriate solution to a particular problem.

Case studies for inclusion will be agreed between the National Park Authority and the delivery body. Case studies will only consist of those schemes that have been agreed and delivered, rather than design concepts.

General Questions

Question 18. Do you think that this document will help with the preparation of planning applications (Yes or No)?

- There were six responses to this question, with five respondents indicating that they thought that the document would help with the preparation of planning applications. The remaining respondent was unsure and offered the following additional comments.
- It was felt that the document was light on specific guidance; we believe that the revisions undertaken within Chapters 7 to 14 (**Elements**) address this concern.
- It was suggested that the document be accompanied with a commitment to work with others to ensure that the aims of the document were delivered. Once the document is adopted, it is intended that the Authority will work with partners to this end.
- It was suggested that the use of appropriate illustrations of good design would be useful. The final version of the document will include photographs and diagrams to promote good design.
- Sustainable transport had been highlighted as being missing from the Design Guide; we believe that Chapters 7 to 14 (**Elements**) address this concern.

Question 19. Are there any other things that you would like to feedback to us about the document?

There were a number of suggestions offered here; these were: -

- *"Parking should include disabled parking and possibilities of including a hoist to enable the safe transportation for visitors from their vehicle into their wheelchair".* We believe that the current version of the SPD addresses the first part of this suggestion. The latter part in relation to the provision of hoists, whilst supported falls outside of the scope of this document.
- *"Pockets of open space should be included to provide quiet, tranquil areas for everyone".* Whilst this may have some relevance to 'Chapter 11 Design guidance elements – public realm and street furniture', it is largely beyond the scope of this document.
- *"Seek possibilities of solar powered charging stations (for wheelchairs)".* This is something that does not currently feature within the document. However, we have provided scope within 'Chapter 14 Design guidance elements – future technology' for electric charging points and other forms of future technology to be incorporated within the guide at a future date.
- *"Use of tactile paving and relevant signage".* We believe that this is now covered adequately within Chapters 7 to 14 (**Elements**).
- *"Main roads should have alternative off-road routes for sustainable transport (e.g. Woodhead and the TPT in the valley bottom)".* This is outside of the scope of this document, which focuses on the design of new infrastructure rather than the requirement for it.
- *"Consideration should be given to minor linking roads having reduced speed limits – 60 mph is a considerable speed for a country lane within the Peak District" and "In residential areas consideration should be given to decrease the speed limit to 20 mph".* The setting of speed limits is outside of the scope of this document.
- *"The current documentation makes very little reference to current or improved sustainable transport needs. It is imperative that consultations of this nature include sustainable travel as part of transport issues and not as an added extra thought. In its current form the document is a missed opportunity for the Peak District National Park Authority to showcase their support by incorporating sustainable travel within all consultations".* We believe that the revised document incorporates sustainable travel infrastructure. However, it should be remembered that this document is a Transport Infrastructure Design Guide aimed at influencing the design of transport infrastructure rather than a bespoke sustainable transport plan.
- *"The whole purpose of good design of traffic signing will continue to be defeated if the PDNPA continues its practice of letting everyone erect or display signs in the highway wherever they like. This is the cause of much of the clutter in towns such as Bakewell but advertisement signs out in the country also spoil its character. If signs are needed they should be of the accepted brown type but the rest should be removed. There is not much point in getting highway authorities to adopt higher standards if the present free-for-all continues!"* 'Chapter 10 Design guidance elements – road signs and road markings' offers an approach to ensuring that signage is delivered in a manner that has regard to the National Park setting. Unfortunately, the guide can only ever apply to legitimate signage. For all other signs, there is a route through the appropriate highway authority for the removal of unlawful signage on the highway.

- “Could the guidance highlight the need for advertising consent for certain types of signage?” ‘Chapter 10 Design guidance elements – road signs and road markings covers advertising consent.
- “Traffic noise should be addressed through appropriate highway surfacing that reduces noise and enhances tranquillity”. We believe that the guidance offered within ‘Chapter 8 Design guidance elements – roads, junctions and access layouts’ addresses this concern.
- A reference was made for the need for the guide to apply to Non classified roads and Green Lanes. This is picked up within ‘Chapter 8 Design guidance elements – roads, junctions and access layouts’.
- Bamford Parish Council put forward the suggestion that Bamford would make a good case study. This will be considered moving forward, and after consultation with the Parish Council and appropriate highway authority.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of plain English within the document. Whilst the document is a technical document, we have sought to improve the readability of the revised document.
- We received comments from Hartington Town Quarter Parish Council in relation to the Hartington Streetscape Study, expressing concern that they had not been consulted in its formulation. Whilst the approach undertaken was to demonstrate a concept rather than to put forward an actual proposal, we accept that the parish council should have been consulted in relation to this, in advance.
- We received the following comments “Parking doesn't seem to be included in your traffic policy and as cars are the number one traffic in a poorly served public transport National Park I think it is safe to say more needs to be done to provide more - for residents and visitors otherwise the destruction of villages and verges will increase.” The SPD deals with how parking is designed, through Chapter 9 Design guidance elements – parking’. The National Park Authority’s planning policies in relation to parking are contained within our other policy documents.
- We received the following comments from one of our constituent highway authorities “Our main concern, however, was that the SPD had no jurisdiction over Highway Authority improvements which are permitted development and therefore outside the planning system. The council has its own protocols for ensuring that environmental and heritage matters are considered and accordingly, it is not PDNPA's role to determine whether the County Council's schemes are acceptable or not”. The National Park Authority accepts that our constituent highway authorities deliver schemes that fall under the General Permitted Development Order, and therefore do not require planning permission.

However, all public bodies undertaking works within or affecting land within a National Park have a legal obligation under Section 62 of the Environment Act (1995) to have regard to National Park purposes. This includes when undertaking works that fall under the General Permitted Development Order. The SPD offers advice to highway authorities to ensure that they fulfil this legal obligation.

- Other concerns raised by two of our constituent highway authorities related to the cost of ongoing maintenance, where better quality materials are used in the design of new transport schemes. One response requested an acknowledgement of this fact. We do accept that raising the standards of materials may increase maintenance costs, and this was acknowledged within the original consultation document. However, the overall minimalist approach engendered within the document may serve to reduce costs overall. Similarly, the use of higher quality materials may mean that they are longer lasting, require lower maintenance and therefore cost less overall.

- One response stated that “*it appears that the Draft SPD has been drafted primarily from a design point of view with little consideration given to the traffic management and highways safety implications of the design policies and principles*”. We believe that the revised document takes a balanced approach, recognising the requirement for transport infrastructure to be functional. However, we also believe that in many cases this can be achieved in a manner that has greater regard to the National Park setting and purposes.
- The requirement for signage to be clearly visible to be effective was raised, and this is acknowledged within the SPD. We believe that the SPD offers an approach that recognises the requirement for functional statutory and advisory signage, whilst taking a solution led approach, which minimises visual impact on the surrounding area.
- The requirement for the guide to consider charging points for electric vehicles was raised. Whilst this does not have a specific section within the document, the requirement to account for the introduction of changes in technology is reflected within ‘*Chapter 14 Design guidance elements – future technology*’.