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Executive summary

- A higher than expected number of planning approvals have been observed in the Natural Zone. A small research project will assess the nature of these developments;
- Continued fluctuations are observed in housing completions data with below average figures in 2013/14 and above average (28 net completions) in 2014/15;
- Both monitoring years highlight both losses and gains in community facilities, principally to residential use. Higher figures were observed in 2014/15 with 17 losses and 9 gains.
- A noticeable increase in barn conversion applications have been received testing the basis for policy and encouraging greater scrutiny of the core approach to heritage and landscape planning;
- A series of refusals for wind turbines in the White Peak in the context of positive activity generally regarding applications for low carbon and renewable energy technologies. 24 permissions for such technology over the previous two monitoring periods;
- Solar arrays, both on farm shed roofs and ground based are becoming more popular as discrete alternatives to the wind turbines, while a number of turbines have now been approved, particularly in the more varied topography of the South West Peak. Positive action regarding a rebranded Climate Change SPD, web-based case studies and a farm based renewables project are assisting take up. In mid-2015 the Authority has received its first application for an Anaerobic Digester, on a farm in the White Peak;
- The Authority has engaged closely with transport and utilities bodies in discussions regarding the undergrounding of high voltage electricity lines in the Longdendale Valley (Woodhead Pass), and the scope for passing loops on the Hope Valley railway line;
- Ongoing success with cycling bids has led to the roll out of planned links to gateway towns during 2015/16;
- The need for high quality, distinctive building stone in support has been boosted during the period with approvals at Once a Week Quarry and Burntwood Quarry whilst raising the difficult balance that must be made with biodiversity objectives. Furthermore on going quarrying applications at Stanton Moor have sought to balance the need for stone with the need to protect the special archaeological value and tranquility of the natural environment;
- An open market house approved in open countryside near Meerbrook is approved on the basis that there is no other way to address a family’s needs. This raises issues for the spatial strategy in the South West Peak which is challenged by the lack of distinct settlements across the area. A new project for the South West Peak aims to respond to the particular issues of this “landscape at a crossroads”;
- Significant progress now being made with neighbourhood planning across the whole National Park and involving all 3 distinctive character areas;
- The Duty to Cooperate in plan making is active right across the National Park with constituent authorities. In Derbyshire a spatial statement is being drafted in support of the emerging Combined Authority (CA). The National Park Authority has observer status to the CA and is able to input key messages regarding the National Park;
- 2 new SPD’s with a technical design focus have been adopted. These cover Alterations and Extensions, and Shopfronts.
- Some gaps in data remain owing to a lack of specialist resource able to make the necessary planned changes to the M3 planning database.
1. Introduction

The National Park Authority adopted the LDF Core Strategy in October 2011. The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) from this point forward will monitor policies in the Core Strategy. This involves monitoring National Park Planning Policy with a focus on the longer-term direction of travel for spatial development with the National Park (see page 157 of the Peak District National Park Authority Core Strategy for the Monitoring Framework).

This Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) relates to the period from 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2015. Its purpose is to monitor progress on preparing documents in the Local Development Plan, and the extent to which policies in the current Development Plan, (which during that period comprised the adopted Core Strategy and saved policies of the Local Plan adopted 2001), are being achieved.

Following the Localism Act in March 2012 the statutory requirement for local planning authorities to produce an Annual Monitoring Report was removed, while retaining the overall duty to monitor. Authorities can now choose which targets and indicators to include in the report as long as they are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant UK and EU legislation. Guidance from Planning Advisory Service (an advisory agency for the department of Communities and Local Government) confirms that in future the report’s primary purpose will be to consider and share the performance and achievements of the Planning Service with the local community.

Although the AMR will have a greater focus on local issues and data, monitoring will continue to be aligned with the National Park Management Plan and other district, county and national monitoring indicators to highlight how delivery in the National Park contributes to both the socio-economic welfare of the wider Peak District and to a range of local and national priorities for action (such as social housing and health issues).

In accordance with government intentions in the Localism Act 2011, the East Midlands Regional Plan has now been revoked. Since this development, the AMRs have continued to provide information on policies and indicate where monitoring systems are still required. However, to commence the transition from top down to locally responsive monitoring, various indicators required previously by government have now been removed. These national and regional indicators were not applicable to the National Park and the data has consistently been unavailable to monitor in a systematic way.

The boundary of the Peak District National Park (PDNP) does not align to other administrative boundaries. Data to fit the Park boundary has been used where available. In other cases, a ‘best fit’ geography has been used based on the smallest geographical areas for which data is available. The National Park Authority (NPA) continues to press for data available to Local Authorities from government related sources to be made available to National Park Authorities (NPAs) on the same basis, to avoid the additional costs currently incurred.

AMRs will be structured to reflect the policies and objectives of the Core Strategy. It will begin to consider delivery at a spatial scale, addressing the 3 broad areas set out above. Moreover, in addition to the normal collection of data it will utilise qualitative descriptions to reflect on the “direction of travel” for Core Policy and the Plan as a whole, as well as recording particular planning cases that have tested the intent of policy. A first review will take place into the achievement of policies upon completion of the Development Management Policies document, anticipated for 2016. The Core Strategy will have operated for 5 years in October 2016.
2. Spatial Portrait

The National Park is a complex tapestry of different landscapes but there are three distinct areas: the less populated upland moorland areas and their fringes (the Dark Peak and Moorland Fringes); the most populated lower-lying limestone grasslands and limestone dales and the Derwent and Hope Valleys (the White Peak and Derwent Valley); and the sparsely populated mixed moorland and grassland landscapes of the south west (the South West Peak). The challenges for spatial planning in the National Park broadly fall into seven closely related themes:

- Landscapes and conservation
- Recreation and tourism
- Climate change and sustainable building
- Homes, shops and community facilities
- Supporting economic development
- Minerals
- Accessibility, travel and traffic

A full spatial portrait was included in the adopted Core Strategy to describe the spatial issues affecting the National Park at the time of production. This provides a baseline set of conditions and background against which Core Policies were developed. Policies may then be viewed as a strategic response to help achieve the statutory purposes of the National Park and in doing so to also provide a framework for the delivery of sustainable forms of development.

For the purposes of effective monitoring the Authority is keen to record annually the contextual changes occurring around the National Park and its Core Strategy so that a proper consideration may be given to the performance of policies and their relevance to the National Park and the issues facing it.

Hence this section provides an update of spatial issues and challenges across the 7 themes highlighted above.

During this period the Authority also began the production of a set of development management policies which will work alongside and in support of the Core Strategy. The process not only helps in the positive management of development but also maintains the dialogue on planning issues with communities, businesses, land owners and statutory bodies to ensure that policies are relevant and as consistent as possible with the National Planning Policy Framework.
2.1 Spatial Vision

Early in the process of developing the LDF Core Strategy, the consultation around issues was closely entwined with the developing National Park Management Plan. The result was broad support to use the same vision for the Management Plan and Core Strategy documents. The vision in the spatial plan should always be based on the NPMP.

This principle was retested during the examination into the Core Strategy. The key issue was that over time, should the Management Plan Vision change, would this leave the spatial strategy vision out of date. As such explanation was included in the Core Strategy to say:

“This Core Strategy is the principal document of the Local Development Framework (LDF), and provides the spatial planning expression of the National Park Management Plan (NPMP) 2006-2011 and its successors. The NPMP established a vision, which the Core Strategy builds upon in the spatial vision and outcomes at Chapter 8. At the time of adoption of the Core Strategy, the NPMP is being reviewed, taking account of the new influences on the overall vision. Further reviews will take place during the life of the Core Strategy. The revised Management Plan vision should be read in conjunction with this Core Strategy. The National Park Authority is confident that an enduring relationship between the LDF and the NPMP (and its successors) is a sound approach to maintaining a relevant spatial vision and strategy”

The Vision for the National Park was developed in the current National Park Management Plan for 2012-17 and reads as follows:

![Image of the National Park Vision]

During consultation on the Core Strategy, several detailed suggestions were made to amend the spatial objectives. The overriding advice from the Government and Planning Advisory Service has been the need to develop an increased spatial, “place-based” approach to developing objectives and ultimately, policies. Consideration of this and comments by stakeholders has led to the development of more area based spatial objectives for the Core Strategy.
2.2 Spatial Outcomes and Objectives

The spatial outcomes for the Peak District National Park are that by 2026:

- **Landscapes and Conservation**
  
  The valued characteristics and landscape character of the National Park will be conserved and enhanced.

- **Recreation and Tourism**
  
  A network of high quality, sustainable sites and facilities will have encouraged and promoted increased enjoyment and understanding of the National Park by everybody including its residents and surrounding urban communities.

- **Climate Change and Sustainable Building**
  
  The National Park will have responded and adapted to climate change in ways that have led to reduced energy consumption, reduced CO₂ emissions, increased proportion of overall energy use provided by renewable energy infrastructure, and conserved resources of soil, air, and water.

- **Homes, Shops and Community Facilities**
  
  The National Park’s communities will be more sustainable and resilient with a reduced unmet level of affordable housing need and improved access to services.

- **Supporting Economic Development**
  
  The rural economy will be stronger and more sustainable, with more businesses contributing positively to conservation and enhancement of the valued characteristics of the National Park whilst providing high quality jobs for local people.

- **Minerals**
  
  The adverse impact of mineral operations will have been reduced.

- **Accessibility, Travel and Traffic**
  
  Transport sustainability for residents and visitors will have been improved in ways that have safeguarded the valued characteristics of the National Park.

Area-based Spatial Objectives have then been drawn up to highlight the way that Core Policies are expected to lead to a different outcome in different areas of the National Park to reflect the variety of landscape types, community characteristics and local priorities.

The Authority is keen to develop the capacity to monitor at this spatial scale and will be working with partners as part of the review of the landscape Strategy and Action plan. The recent acquisition of the Earthlight GIS tool by the Authority will greater assist the aspiration to monitor and present information spatially.
Dark Peak and Moorland Fringe

**Landscapes and Conservation policies will:**
- Protect the remoteness, wildness, open character and tranquillity of the Dark Peak landscapes
- Protect and manage the Eastern Moors upland landscapes including through the promotion of the Moors for the Future Project
- Seek opportunities to manage and enhance cultural heritage, biodiversity, recreational opportunities and tranquillity whilst maintaining the open character
- Manage the landscapes to mitigate the impacts of climate change
- Seek opportunities to protect and manage the tranquil pastoral landscapes and the distinctive cultural character of the Dark Peak Yorkshire Fringe
- Seek opportunities to enhance recreation opportunities, woodlands, wilderness, and diversity of more remote areas
- Protect and manage the settled, cultural character and the biodiversity and recreational resources of the Dark Peak Western Fringe whilst maintaining strong cultural associations with the Dark Peak landscapes

**Recreation and Tourism policies will:**
- Enable development of appropriate sites and facilities at key sites such as the Hope Valley, Stanage Edge, the Upper Derwent, Langsett and Longshaw
- In countryside locations between the remoter moorlands and surrounding urban areas, limit development to appropriate signage and interpretation, in line with the Recreation Strategy, Interpretation Plan and Working with People and Communities Strategy
- Help constituent councils to use the potential for activity that addresses poor health and improves equality of opportunity
- Support tourist accommodation that is particularly suited to the wilder and quieter areas, such as back-pack or farm-based tent and caravan sites

**Climate Change and Sustainable Building policies will:**
- Support work to protect peatland and promote its role as a carbon sink
- Support work to manage floodplain landscapes to increase flood storage and enhance biodiversity
- Protect open skylines, long views and semi-natural moorland expanses. Support work to protect peatland and promote its role as a carbon sink

**Homes, Shops and Community Facilities policies (in the context of the Development Strategy (DS1)) will be able to support:**
- The provision of affordable homes for local need and consolidate services in the following settlements Edale, Hayfield, High Bradfield, Holme, Little Hayfield, Low Bradfield, and Tintwistle
  - The provision of between 35 and 75 homes in Edale, Hayfield, High Bradfield, Holme, Little Hayfield, Low Bradfield and Tintwistle (depending on identified capacity) with perhaps an additional 35 outside these settlements, agricultural dwellings and change of use or conversion.

**Economy policies will:**
- Support agricultural and land management businesses that conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the landscape.
- Support diversification of agriculture and land management businesses
- Encourage the effective re-use of traditional buildings of merit

**Minerals policies will:**
- No specific outcomes for this area

**Accessibility, Travel and Traffic policies will seek to ensure:**
- The Woodhead route will be safeguarded but without accepting the principle of a new or reinstated railway
- Opportunities will be taken to increase public transport, particularly if they are integrated with recreational and leisure activities
- The TransPennine Trail will be retained
- The A628 Tintwistle bypass route will not be protected
White Peak and Derwent Valley

Landscape and Conservation policies will:

- Protect and manage the distinctive and valued historic character of the settled, agricultural landscapes of the White Peak, while seeking opportunities to enhance the wild character and diversity of remoter areas
- Protect and manage the settled, agricultural character of the Derwent Valley landscapes, seeking opportunities to enhance wooded character, cultural heritage and biodiversity
- Manage floodplain landscapes to increase flood storage and enhance biodiversity
- Protect and manage the tranquil pastoral landscapes and distinctive cultural character of the Derbyshire Peak Fringe through sustainable landscape management, seeking opportunities to enhance woodlands, wetlands, cultural heritage and biodiversity

Recreation and Tourism policies will:

- Support the development of appropriate facilities in recognised visitor locations such as Bakewell, Castleton, the Hope Valley, Dovedale, Chatsworth and Ilam
- Support work that maintains and fills gaps in the rights of way network
- Protect the recreational value of the Manifold, Tissington, and High Peak trails
- Retain the continuity of the Monsal Trail and explore its further potential
- Consolidate Bakewell’s role as a tourist centre and a hub from which to explore other attractions
- Support the change of use of traditional buildings to visitor accommodation
- Enable a new hotel in Bakewell

Climate Change policies will:

- Support work to manage floodplain landscapes and enhance biodiversity

Homes and Communities policies (in the context of the Development Strategy (DS1)) will be able to support:

- The provision of between 550 and 890 homes, affordable homes for local need and consolidate services in the following settlements Alstonefield, Ashford, Bakewell, Bamford, Baslow, Beeley, Biggin, Birchover, Bradwell, Calver, Castleton, Chelmorton, Curbaz, Earl Sterndale, Edensor, Elton, Eyam, Fenny Bentley, Flagg, Foolow, Froggatt, Great Hucklow, Great Longstone, Grindleford, Hartington, Hathersage, Hope, Litton, Middleton by Youlgrave, Monyash, Over Haddon, Parwich, Peak Forest, Pilsley, Rowsley, Stanton in Peak, Stoney Middleton, Taddington, Thorpe, Tideswell, Tissington, Wardlow, Wensley, Wetton, Winster, and Youlgrave (depending on identified capacity)

with perhaps 125 outside these settlements, agricultural dwellings and change of use or conversion

Economy policies will:

- Support business start-up and development particularly where it creates high skill - high wage jobs in the places shown on the key diagram
- Retain and enhance the role of Bakewell as a market town and centre for agricultural business
- Safeguard employment sites in sustainable locations such as Bakewell, Tideswell and through the Hope Valley, but consider redevelopment of lower quality employment sites in less sustainable locations for other uses including mixed use
- Support agricultural and land management businesses that conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the landscape
- Support diversification of agriculture and land management businesses;
- Encourage the effective re-use of traditional buildings of merit

Minerals policies will:

- Allow the underground working of fluorspar ore from Watersaw and Milldam Mines whilst resisting proposals for fluorspar working by opencast methods

Accessibility, Travel, and Traffic policies will seek to ensure:

- The line of the Bakewell relief road will not be safeguarded
- Opportunities will be taken to enhance services on the Hope Valley Railway Line, particularly if they demonstrate a lasting decrease in private cars on adjacent roads
- The Matlock to Buxton route will be safeguarded but without accepting the principle of a new or reinstated railway
- The Monsal Trail will be retained
South West Peak

Landscape and Conservation policies will:
- Protect and manage the distinctive historic character of the landscapes
- Seek opportunities to celebrate the diverse landscapes
- Enhance recreation opportunities, woodlands, wilderness and diversity of remoter areas

Recreation and Tourism policies will:
- Manage off-road recreation so that legitimate uses and users can enjoy the area without damaging the landscape or other peoples’ enjoyment of it
- Support measures to improve visitor access into and around the area

Climate Change policies will:
- Support work to manage floodplain landscapes and enhance biodiversity
- Support work to protect peatland and promote its role as a carbon sink

Homes and Communities policies (in the context of the Development Strategy (DS1)) will be able to support:
- The provision of affordable homes for local need and consolidate services in the following settlements Butterton, Calton, Flash, Grindon, Kettlethulme, Longnor, Rainow, Waterhouses, and Warslow
- The provision of between 30 and 130 homes in Butterton, Calton, Flash, Grindon, Kettlethulme, Longnor, Rainow, Sheen, Waterhouses and Warslow (depending on identified capacity) with perhaps an additional 30 outside these settlements, agricultural dwellings and change of use or conversion.

Economy policies will:
- Seek to retain an appropriate range of employment sites in sustainable locations such as Longnor and Warslow
- Support agricultural and land management businesses that conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the landscape
- Support diversification of agriculture and land management businesses
- Encourage the effective re-use of traditional buildings of merit

Minerals policies will:
- No specific outcomes for this area

Accessibility, Travel and Traffic policies will seek to ensure:
- Increasing sustainable access for residents and visitors to key services, facilities and visitor places of interest
2.3 Progress at a Spatial Scale

Heat map to show the location of all permitted applications during the monitoring period. This highlights the spatial differences across the 3 areas.

The Dark Peak and Moorland Fringe

The Natural Zone designation features strongly in this area and continues to be an effective tool in landscape protection, ensuring that the development is limited to development essential to the area and focussed predominantly on the few existing properties already within the area, thus maintaining scenic value, tranquillity and the largely undeveloped character of these wilder and more natural areas. This policy framework also provides an effective context for the extensive landscape partnership projects operating across the dark Peak and moorland Fringes, namely Moors for the Future and the Eastern Moors Partnership. These projects have wide ranging benefits including peatland restoration, water capture and a focus on birdlife in areas that have European protection for their landscape importance.

Development is predominantly focussed into the fringe landscapes and supported through close working with High Peak Borough Council and local communities e.g. in Hayfield and Edale to enable affordable housing. A growing number of communities have received support from the Authority and constituent councils in preparing neighbourhood plans. Plans are at various stages of development from the early attempts to designate an area in Saddleworth to the near adoption of the plan at Chapel-en-le-Frith. Other active communities include Whaley Bridge, Holme and Dore with their Neighbourhood Plan. Also in this area officers have worked closely with Sheffield and Barnsley councils to agree a methodology for greenbelt review ensuring that the quality and integrity of fringe landscapes are conserved.

Through the monitoring period, officers have also worked closely with neighbouring authorities as they prepare their own Local Plans. Concern over the proximity of large new housing allocations in the High Peak led the Authority to carefully consider its position regarding the potential for future harm. A jointly signed memorandum of understanding has now been prepared to agree areas of policy where close working is needed to ensure the right kind of development is achieved, reflecting landscape character and traditional building styles.

In the Longdendale Valley, the Authority has engaged closely with the National Grid as they explore proposals for undergrounding significant tracts of high voltage power lines. This could result in significant landscape enhancement. Moreover the government has tabled early proposals for road improvements on the A628 with the aim of improving travel times between Sheffield and Manchester. Long term plans also indicate the possibility of a tunnel underneath the National Park.

Other transport initiatives in the area include discussions with Network Rail regarding the scope for and potential impacts arising from passing loops on the Hope Valley line to improve train speeds and capacity between Sheffield and Manchester.

The Authority’s recreation and sustainable transport objectives have been greatly bolstered by the second successful bid for funds to improve cycling infrastructure across and into the national park from a range of gateway sites, such as Langsett in the eastern fringe.

Recreation and Tourism policy has also been used to guide improvements to key visitor sites with an extension to the National Trust car park at Longshaw, and the improvement of facilities at the North Lees campsite, including the introduction of 2 camping pods to enable all year round camping. This follows advice given at the Crowden campsite to ensure that any permanent wooden structures are approved as an exception where there is minimal landscape impact. Delivery of these projects is likely to take place during the 2015/16 year.
White Peak and Derwent Valley

The White Peak and Derwent valley represents the most populated parts of the National Park and across the many villages, farms and individual properties lies the greatest potential for development in the National Park.

Policies seek to manage the impact of development carefully so as to protect the valued character of the area. Through 2013-2015 the Government proposed a raft of changes to national policies with the aim of freeing up the planning system and creating more freedom for development without the need for planning permission. This is known as permitted development. Some of the changes have now been enacted and have greatest potential for impact in the open farmed landscapes of the White Peak. Changes include the ability for farm buildings to be converted to a range of commercial uses. Following a firm lobbying campaign by the family of National Parks a proposal to allow farm buildings to change to residential use without the need for planning permission was amended in 2014 in order to exempt National Parks. As such all applications must go through the full planning route making them subject to local policy requirements. As such the Authority has been working to complete its Development Management Policies which will bring greater clarity and detail to this issue.

The long term sustainability of White Peak farms has also been emphasised through this period with discussions centering on farmer succession and the further scope for farm diversification with its interrelations to other rural business and land management. The expansion of a large manufacturing business in open countryside near Bradwell again highlighted the need for strong principles in policy for sustainable land management practices which do not sever the link between economy and environment. Plus the landscape based approach leads us to consider the appropriate threshold for large buildings and operations in areas of landscape that require protection in order to achieve statutory conservation objectives.

During the monitoring period a series of applications have begun to test the scope for open market housing to be realised through the barn conversion route and as such issues such as building quality and their significance as a heritage asset have been developed further along with the need to carefully consider the impact of domestication and urbanisation on the historic farmland setting which is so valued as a characteristic of the White Peak.

The Climate Change SPD has been redesigned and promoted in 2015 to encourage such developments. Wind turbine applications have continued to test core policies and led to a series of important decisions which have confirmed the landscape first principle, particularly in the open setting of the White Peak plateau. The take up of solar panels on farm shed roofs and other technologies such as ground and air source heat pump systems highlights the scope for more appropriate alternatives that respect the particular landscape characteristics of this area. Further efforts have been made to engage with the farming community, encouraging a range of renewable and energy efficiency measures. Looking into 2015/16 the Authority has received its first application for a farm based anaerobic digester (AD). This is on one of the larger dairy farms in the White Peak. The Authority will monitor this case closely in the next AMR to consider the impact and operation of core policy CC4 which focusses specifically on this issue.

Neighbourhood plans are progressing in Bakewell and Hartington. Particular strides have been made in Bakewell to support early stages of consultation. Debate continues on the future of existing employment areas in the town. Following the approval of a former factory site to a supermarket, interest now lies in the future of the Riverside Business Park and the need to achieve the right mix of development both to support the employment needs of the town and also to facilitate a bridge into the site to allow appropriate improvements and optimum take up of businesses into the future. Such considerations go hand in hand with the impact such changes may have on the health and viability of the town centre. As such it will be vital for the Authority to work closely with the community to see the best possible policy outcome for the National Park’s main town.

In terms of tourism and recreation policy the main focus has been on developing cycling initiatives. Significant improvements have been made along the Monsal Trail between Bakewell and Woo Dale and further consideration is being put to improvements at the Authority owned assets at Millers Dale and Parsley Hay. Further links are progressing at the southern tip of the White Peak at Waterhouses with links to the Manifold Valley and at Rowsley where a route is planned to connect with the Monsal Trail at Bakewell.
**South West Peak**

The South West Peak was recognised during this period as a landscape at a crossroads. A project supported by the Heritage Lottery fund has been set up to support community projects and consider the role of the area as a historic landscape with a huge array of heritage assets in need of protection, repair and re-use as part of a sustainable package.

Work continues in partnership with English heritage to bring forward a package of character statements relating to the historic farmsteads of the Peak District. It is hoped this could guide the management and protection of a range of farmsteads, and more remote barns across areas like the South West Peak.

The scattered nature of settlement in the South West with its relative lack of defined villages and the related difficulties in accessing affordable housing and essential services has been identified as challenges to the implementation of the spatial strategy for this area. A case near Meerbrook highlighted this issue with an approval for a new house in the open countryside, an approach that was clearly contrary to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Neighbourhood planning is are being supported at Leekfrith (including Meerbrook and Upper Hulme) and Onecote. The Authority will consider innovative local policies that can address the spatial issues associated with the South West Peak within the overall spatial objectives and statutory purposes of the National Park.

Further cycling initiatives are being supported in this area including links from Leek towards the Roaches.

With regard to climate change policies the more varied topography and mosaic of landscape types has demonstrated greater potential for renewable energy development with a number of small scale wind turbine developments, and an innovative approach to harvesting solar energy using a ground mounted array at a farm near Meerbrook.

Duty to Cooperate discussions continue with constituent authorities in Staffordshire Moorlands and Cheshire East.
3.0 Progress in Plan Making

The Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out the various documents that comprise the Local Development Plan for the area. It establishes profiles describing the role of each document and details the timetable for their preparation. The Authority approved a revised LDS in March 2015 to update the position with regard to plan making since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011.

The diagram below details the Local Development Plan, and the relationship between Local Development Documents and Development Plan Documents. The agreed timescales for producing the Local Development Plan are set out in the Local Development Scheme.

SUMMARY DIAGRAM OF THE PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

[Diagram showing the relationship between Local Development Documents and Development Plan Documents, with nodes indicating various plans and reports such as Core Strategy DPD, Neighbourhood Plans, Supplementary Planning Documents, etc.]

Local Development Documents:
- Core Strategy DPD (Adopted 2011)
- Saved Local Plan (2001)
- Statement of Community Involvement (2012)
- Annual Monitoring Report
- Neighbourhood Plans
- PROPOSALS MAP

Development Plan Documents:
- SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS:
  - Peak District Design Guide
  - Village Design Statements
  - Climate Change and Sustainable Building
  - Affordable Housing
  - Farm Buildings
  - Shop Fronts
  - Extensions and Alterations

[Diagram with Local Development Documents and Development Plan Documents]
## Local Development Scheme Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Role and content</th>
<th>Geographical coverage</th>
<th>Chain of conformity</th>
<th>Pre-production survey and involvement</th>
<th>Date for pre-submission consultation</th>
<th>Date for submission to Secretary of State</th>
<th>Proposed date for adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Statement of Community Involvement</td>
<td>LDD</td>
<td>Describes how stakeholders and the community will be involved in the LDF and planning applications.</td>
<td>Whole National Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Adopted May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy (Part 1)</td>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Sets the vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the National Park, and the primary policies for achieving the vision.</td>
<td>Whole National Park</td>
<td>Consistent with National Planning Policy</td>
<td>September – October 2010</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td>Adopted October 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management Policies (Part 2)</td>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Policies which will ensure that development meets certain criteria and contributes to the achievement of the Core Strategy.</td>
<td>Whole National Park</td>
<td>Consistent with the Core Strategy and national policy.</td>
<td>From October 2011</td>
<td>October – November 2015</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Map</td>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Illustrates the spatial application of LDF policies &amp; proposals on an Ordnance Survey base map. Prepared with DPDs which identify policy areas or have site allocations.</td>
<td>Whole National Park</td>
<td>Consistent with the Core Strategy and Development Management DPD’s</td>
<td>From Feb 2014</td>
<td>October - November 2015</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Hubs Area Action Plan</td>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Contains policies to improve the quality of visitor facilities and sustainability of built fabric at key specific sites across the whole.</td>
<td>Specific sites across the whole</td>
<td>Consistent with the Core Strategy</td>
<td>From June 2014</td>
<td>June - July 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>DPD</strong></td>
<td>Policies to manage development, exploring settlement capacity, opportunities for affordable housing, businesses and community facilities as well as seeking opportunities to conserve and enhance and features of local value.</td>
<td><strong>Parishes across the National Park. 7 communities with designated areas at time of writing (see map on page 12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>To conform with the Core Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>On-going from Jan 2013</strong></td>
<td><strong>On-going with communities at different stages</strong></td>
<td><strong>On-going with communities at different stages</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barn Conversions SPD</strong></td>
<td><strong>SPD</strong></td>
<td>Guidance to support the re-use of traditional barns and their role as heritage assets in a historic landscape, through high quality design and consideration of landscape setting.</td>
<td><strong>Whole National Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>To conform with Core Strategy and Development Management Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>From mid 2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>October 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing the Local Need For Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>SPD</strong></td>
<td>Updated guidance and definitions to support the delivery of affordable housing in the National Park with an explanation of terms such as need and eligibility, and setting out the requirements for planning obligations</td>
<td><strong>Whole National Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>To conform with Core Strategy and Development Management Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>July 2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>February 2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Monitoring Report</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>Sets out progress in producing DPDs &amp; SPDs and implementing policies, action needed to meet targets, and any changes needed.</td>
<td><strong>Whole National Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>July each year</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Policy Monitoring

4.1 Measuring performance

Each indicator has been assigned a colour based on a status of;

- **Green – Indicator on track** - indicator target achieved and/or within acceptable limits and/or on trend
- **Amber – agreed targets or measures of performance are not being achieved but not a recurring trend or concern** - Reasonable progress towards success factor anticipated
- **Red – agreed targets or measures of performance are not being achieved and it is unlikely that this will be addressed without specific interventions**

The targets below are based on a direction of travel and in most cases a numeric target has not been applied. Other indicators are based on a textual format, where progress is measured by a qualitative review of action and monitoring of Policy.
4.1 General Spatial Policies

4.1.1 Policy Objectives
General Spatial Policy (GSP) 1 sets the distinctive context for a sustainable approach to development in the context of its statutory purposes to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of these areas by the public. GSP 2 provides a particular focus on the need to enhance as well as conserve the National Park by seeking to understand the particular valued characteristics that may be affected as part of any development and exploring ways of enhancing these characteristics as far as possible. GSP 3 provides a set of Development Management Principles in order to ensure an appropriate level of sensitivity to the finer level details that cumulatively make a National Park stand out as being a landscape of high quality. GSP 4 provides a framework for the consideration of the use of Planning conditions and legal agreements and explains the relationship to infrastructure priorities of constituent local authorities which the National Park must take account of.

The Development Strategy (DS1) provides an overarching framework for all decisions. DS1 sets out the principles and expectations for development across the whole National Park, in effect providing a spatial hierarchy to direct particular forms and scales of development to the most appropriate places, predominantly driven by the statutory conservation purpose but also to promote a sustainable pattern of development within this protected context.

63 settlements are identified as places where new buildings are acceptable for affordable housing, small shops, community and business uses. In the countryside scope is limited to agricultural and land management uses, with a preference for the re-use of traditional buildings. Economic uses are particularly supported as they require less change to the character of buildings and the surrounding landscape. Some parts of the countryside continue to be defined as Natural Zone. These are the wildest, most remote and least developed parts of the Park where the presumption is against all forms of development, except where it might support the management of the area, or by overridden by nationally significant development considered to be more important in the public interest.

4.1.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy DS1</th>
<th>Development Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>New development occurring outside of named settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>80% - 90% of new build development inside named settlements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
An over-supply of new development outside named settlements would adversely affect the sustainability of the area. It would exacerbate problems for service providers, and potentially place more people in remote locations where social interaction and service provision is more difficult, particularly for less mobile members of society, both young and old. It is estimated that the outcome of the strategy will be to direct 80% to 90% of all new development towards the named settlement.

**Indicator:**
There were only 3 new build applications for housing in 2014-2015 all of which were inside named settlements.
Changes to M3 system are required to collect data for applications and permissions.

Discussion:
While this indicator does appear to be on track the value of it is under review as it clear that a very large proportion of development overall does take place outside named settlements. Consideration will be given to reviewing the value and proportion set out in the indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy GSP1</th>
<th>Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Applications granted contrary to Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>contrary to policy principle - tolerance of 3 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>harm/judgement based cases raising significant policy issues – tolerance of 10 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
General spatial policies (GSPs) provide overarching principles for spatial planning in the National Park and relate closely to the delivery of national park purposes. Policy GSP1 seeks that any development proposal will comply with core policies so that any development in the National Park must satisfy the statutory purposes of national park designation. Where there is an irreconcilable conflict between the statutory purposes, the Sandford Principle will be applied and the conservation of the National Park will be given priority.

A proactive response is required to manage either consequence for all policies and understand the cumulative impacts of these decisions.

Indicator:

Granted Contrary to Policy

Target: Reducing with a tolerance of 3

Achieved:
2013/14 2 applications granted contrary to Policy
2014/15 4 applications granted contrary to Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Description</th>
<th>Policies involved</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0413/0248</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, E2 and RT2  and saved Local Plan policy LC14</td>
<td>Scheme already approved as a departure from policy in previous AMR. The removal of the requirement for a legal tie means that separation of the holiday accommodation from the farm business can now occur unhindered with no means to guarantee income returning to the farm business. This poses a longer term threat to the viability and sustainability of the farm business which is essential to local land management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Use of Cattle Barn to Camping Barn, Without Section 106 Obligation, Stoke Farm, Grindleford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/DDD/1213/1075</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, DS1, HC1 and LH1</td>
<td>Application not supported by an eligible need and applicant already in home ownership. Application not supported by an eligible need and applicant already in home ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of a single affordable dwelling – land adjacent to Thorneycroft, Summer Cross, Tideswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed dwelling also separated from edge of village causing concern the proposal would be tantamount to an open market house in the open countryside.

Members remained concerned about the affordability of existing property and as such viewed the scheme as a good solution close to a named village in the Core Strategy.

Raises issues about the means of defining housing need and where flexibility lies in judging local occupancy criteria as well as scope to understand how broadly village edges may be defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0414/0348</td>
<td>Change of Use From a Single Domestic Dwelling to 2 Domestic Flats, Alterations to Rear Porch and the Addition of a New Shed in the Rear Yard at Glenholme, Buxton Road, Bakewell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, HC1 and saved Local Plan policy LH1</td>
<td>Concern that the proposals would not achieve any meaningful enhancements to the site or its setting within Bakewell’s Conservation Area or evidence that the houses were needed to address the local need for affordable housing. Not demonstrated that the subdivision of the existing house into two separate flats is required in order to achieve the conservation or enhancement of a vernacular building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>NP/SM/0514/0468</td>
<td>Renovation and Change of Use of Former Shippon to Detached Dwelling, Bleak House, Newtown, Longnor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, HC1</td>
<td>Building not valued vernacular, therefore no justification for open market housing. Members considered the proposed enhancement was sufficient in this case by ensuring the removal of other eyesore buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>NP/DDD/1213/1144</td>
<td>Erection of Agricultural Building on Land off Bramley Lane, Hassop Common, Calver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, 2, 3 and L1 Saved Local Plan policies LC4 LC13</td>
<td>Concern over siting and scale. The scheme would have a substantial adverse visual impact and would significantly harm the scenic beauty of the National Park. Submission failed to demonstrate that the benefits of granting permission for the revised application would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any adverse impacts of doing so when assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and National Planning Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members believed proposal was justified and benefits outweighed harm.

The application site is not within or on the edge of a named settlement as defined in Core Strategy policy DS1 and therefore the proposals would represent an unsustainable form of development contrary to the aims and policies of the development plan and national policy.

Members concerned that there was no other way to address the needs of the family. There is no village close by named within the Core Strategy (DS1) as such this case raises issues for spatial planning in the South West Peak

Raised significant policy issues

Target: Reducing with a tolerance of 10
Achieved:
2013/14 5 applications raised significant policy issues
2014/15 3 applications raised significant policy issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Description</th>
<th>Policies involved</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0912/0899 Reconstruction And Extension of Building to Form Local Need Dwelling, at The Fold, Little Hucklow</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies DS1, HC1 plus detailed design matters from LC4 and LC8</td>
<td>Prior demolition of existing property raised technical principle of new build house in open countryside, contrary to Core Strategy DS1, HC1. Hamlet setting mitigated any landscape harm and amended plans improved the massing and external appearance. As such principle accepted and did not raise fundamental conflict with policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/HPK/0812/0791 Change Of Use Of Vacant Barn To Holiday Cottage Including New Septic Tank Installation, Higher Barmoor Farm, Doveholes, Peak Forest</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP 1,2,3 L1, RT2 and saved local Plan policies LC4 and LC8</td>
<td>Some concerns regarding the qualities of the building. However Members content That building was of sufficient vernacular merit and the development did not cause unacceptable landscape harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0413/0276 Proposed Erection of Local Need Affordable House, Chapel Street, Monyash</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies DS1 GSP3 L3 and</td>
<td>Concern that a newly built house would fail to conserve the significance of the designated Monyash Conservation Area. Proposed on an important open green space within the Conservation Area, development would undermine the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Core Strategy Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0613/0542</td>
<td>Extension of existing manufacturing business and diversion of existing public footpath at Buxo Plas, quarters Farm, Hazelbadge</td>
<td>Core Strategy Policies L1 E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0713/0582</td>
<td>Re-Development of Business Park to Create Heritage Centre With Craft Shop/Café With Associated Retailing, Two Tied Worker Accommodation Units, Tourist Accommodation Space, Training Room/ Community Facility, Café And Office Space at Rockmill Business Park, The Dale, Stoney Middleton</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, RT1 And Local Plan policies LC4 and LE4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>NP/SM/1014/1087</td>
<td>Change of Use of Barn to Local Needs Person Dwelling, Bassetts Building, Longnor</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L1, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LC8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>NP/DDD/0814/0879</td>
<td>Erection of Two Affordable</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dwellings, The Croft, Litton Dale, Litton | DS1, GSP1, GSP3, HC1 and saved Local plan policies LC3, LC4 and LH1 | harmful landscape and visual impact. Proposals could represent an unsustainable form of development that may lead to pressure to fill the intervening gaps in ribbon form out and away from the village.

Alternative sites identified within Litton and Tideswell, therefore, the case was recommended for refusal.

However members considered the application to be in an appropriate location close to the village, addressing a local need and as such the concerns were outweighed.

Raisers issues about the definition of village edges and how such sites can be accommodated. Such schemes require case by case assessment. |

2014/15 | NP/SM/1114/1132 | Conversion of a redundant stone agricultural building into a residential dwelling to fulfil an affordable local needs housing requirement at Gollin Gate Farm, Quarnford |

Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L1, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LC8, The barn occupies a prominent and exposed position and presently contributes positively to the character and setting of the wider landscape of this part of the National Park. The proposed residential conversion of the barn could spoil the character and setting of the barn by the introduction of a domestic use and associated developments in this sensitive location.

Members felt that there was a clear need for the dwelling and that it would not harm the landscape.

Raisers issues about the need to understand impact to heritage and historic landscape features from domestic conversions. |

Discussion

Indicator highlighted as amber as there are slightly more cases breaking policy principles than targeted. Work progressing on development management policies aims to improve this figure by giving greater guidance and clarity on policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy GSP1</th>
<th>Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>All Policies to be read in combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy:
A planning recommendation and subsequent decision must be made based on concatenating the policy principles in the strategy. This approach will help ensure that all recommendations and decisions secure national park purposes, sustainable development and that the ‘conservation and enhancement of the National Park will be given priority’.

All policies must be read in combination to further the National Park’s legal purposes and duty as established in the Environment Act 1995.

This contextual indicator will provide the raw data to examine policy use/citation over time.

Indicator:
Data not available (currently no system in place to monitor this).

Data for Policy codes needs to be collected in M3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy GSP2</th>
<th>Achieving enhancement of the National Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Permissions granted for removal of undesirable features or buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target is applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
Planning powers can provide an effective mechanism to realise other enhancements to the built and natural environment. Development decisions and other tools may allow opportunities to remove or treat undesirable features or buildings, but works must be undertaken in a sympathetic manner so as not to harm other valued characteristics which may exist on or surrounding a site. This aims to develop an understanding of the cumulative effect of proscriptions for removal/treatment of undesirable features. Inform the use of these powers in the protection/enhancement of valued characteristics of the park. Communicate the effect of these powers.

Indicator:
Data not available (currently no system in place to monitor this).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy GSP3</th>
<th>Development Management Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Applications granted contrary to specialist (internal advice) and statutory consultee advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
It is essential that the standard of design and landscape aspects of new development conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park. The Authority’s specialist fields of knowledge in landscape, biodiversity and cultural heritage are underpinned by high quality guidance notes and appraisal documents.

We are also reliant on technical/regulatory guidance provided by external statutory consultees.

The main consequence of applications granted contrary to specialist advice is that they may, by definition, be at risk of being contrary to the statutory purposes. A proactive response is required to manage and mitigate for this consequence for all policies. The implication being that specialist advice is not followed in rare circumstances to facilitate significant enhancement(s)/protection and that ‘harm’ in one characteristic sphere is therefore mitigated by enhancement in another.

Indicator:
Data not available (currently no system in place to monitor this).
**Policy GSP4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number and type of Section 106 agreements or infrastructure secured through other mechanisms including any introduced Community Infrastructure Levy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target is applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**

Planning consents commonly make use of conditions and legal agreements about specific matters related to development to provide a wider benefit. In the National Park it would be appropriate to include requirements that aid the implementation of national park purposes, for example to make provision for landscaping, or to develop in such a way that species such as bats are able to make use of the new structure. In pursuing national park purposes it would also be appropriate to use conditions/legal agreements to ensure sustainable development e.g. through design and/or measures to improve energy conservation or renewable energy generation.

**Indicator:**

2013/2014 26 Section 106’s made, split into the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of 106</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable occupancy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers occupancy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals relating to what can be extracted and for what use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration and aftercare (one was for quarry, one was for a reservoir)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work relating to an open market house / affordable occupancy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable occupancy / farm workers occupancy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying extension to existing work buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied to main house</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefits / highways / occupancy restrictions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014/2015 27 Section 106’s made, split into the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of 106</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable occupancy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers occupancy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split house after first occupancy and affordable occupancy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricting use to ancillary holiday accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of tree plantation and landscape scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove static caravan fencing prior to development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of works to be implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove business use and change to residential use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral agreement regarding use and development of the land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace a community facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The proportion of s106 use is broadly consistent with previous years but does indicate a broadening of the use of s106 into a wider set of legal matters. The Authority will monitor closely the reasons why s106 are being used over and above planning conditions.
4.1.3 Statement of Progress

The distribution and quantum of permitted applications reflects the landscape characteristics and settlement pattern of the 3 spatial areas defined in the plan.

New build housing has been focussed into named settlements but a large proportion of other development is permitted outside of named settlements in policy DS1. Closer investigation is needed in order to review the current indicator target set out for policy DS1.

Applications raising significant policy issues are running within the tolerance level while schemes recorded as contrary to policy have emerged slightly over the target level. Overall this highlights that the vast majority of cases approved support National Park purposes with only a few cases testing fundamental principles. Several cases test the threshold on design quality and the desired levels of enhancement to the Park’s valued characteristics used to justify development.

It is anticipated that revised development management policy and new design guidance will bring about greater consistency and design quality.

An inability to make desired changes to the M3 Planning database has resulted in some gaps in data. These issues aimed to be resolved for the next AMR.

Nevertheless in a bid to assist the quality and consistency of specialist input into planning decisions 2 new technical design guides have been adopted as supplementary planning documents. These cover extensions and alterations and shopfronts.
4.2 Landscapes and Conservation

4.2.1 Policy Objectives
Allied with the development strategy new policies for Landscapes and Conservation aim to ensure proper regard is always had for Natural Beauty, Wildlife and Cultural Heritage assets in any development proposal in accordance with the statutory purposes of national parks.

L1 clarifies the strict control to be applied in the Natural Zone while development in the remainder of the countryside requires close consideration of the particular landscape characteristics with reference to the adopted Landscape Strategy and Action Plan.

L2 requires that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity and geodiversity importance. Other than in exceptional circumstances development policy aims to resist development where it is likely to have an adverse impact on such sites.

The focus of L3 is on the need for development to conserve and where possible enhance, or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings.

Just as with general spatial policies and the development strategy these policies must always be considered alongside other policies when determining planning applications in order to have proper regard to National Park purposes.

4.2.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Landscape character and valued characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Number of planning permissions for development in the Natural Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
Alongside the adopted Landscape Strategy, legislation requires the National Park Authority to identify areas which it considers are particularly important to conserve. These areas are largely underpinned by Natura 2000 sites and for spatial planning purposes the Authority calls these areas the Natural Zone. The consequence of development in the natural zone is therefore damage or loss of particularly important natural resources.

Indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Minerals Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Planning Application (EIA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Planning Applications (Major Applications and 13 week deadlines)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Planning Permission</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDO Application extended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There have been a significant number of permissions in the Natural Zone. However, the impact of these permission are negligible in terms of no new housing or business developments.

### Policy L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number of permissions granted with conditions Landscape treatment and habitat creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPS1 requires local policies that conserve and enhance wildlife species and enhance as well as protect biodiversity and natural habitats. The emerging PPS: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment states that planning should conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure that the natural environment is integrated into the strategic vision of communities. Policies and decisions should ensure that construction, development and regeneration enhances biodiversity wherever possible and that there is no net loss to biodiversity.

**Indicator:**

Data not available (currently no system in place to monitor).

### Policy L3

#### Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Losses to designated cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposals likely to affect designated or candidate sites of international importance known collectively as Natura 2000 sites, comprising Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs), are subject to separate statutory procedures such as the Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations designed to provide the highest levels of safeguarding. Specific policies are not included for these sites, but the Authority will consider these internationally important sites under L2 and show them on a subsequent proposals map with associated Development Management policies.

The sites, features and species covered by this policy include:
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs);
- National Nature Reserves (NNRs);
- Species listed under the schedules 1, 5 or 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act
- 1981 or subsequent legislation or reviews;
- Local Nature Reserves;
- Local Wildlife Sites or their equivalent;
- Regionally Important Geological Sites, or their equivalent;
- National, regional or local Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats or species;
- Significant populations of national or local Red Data Book or Notable species.

**Indicator:**

Data not available (currently no system in place to monitor).
The following policy covers all cultural heritage assets including, but not exclusively, those assets already subject to development management policies. Cultural heritage assets that are of particular relevance to the planning process in this National Park include Listed Buildings, other buildings of historic or vernacular merit, Conservation Areas, important parks and gardens including those on the national register, and archaeological sites including Scheduled Monuments, features and landscapes. Detailed policy criteria relating to cultural heritage assets will be provided in the Development Management Policies DPD.

**Indicator:**

Data not available (currently no system in place to monitor this).

**4.2.3 Statement of Progress**

An inability to make desired changes to the M3 Planning database has resulted in some gaps in data for landscapes and conservation. These issues aimed to be resolved for the next AMR.

Overall the integrity of the Natural Zone has been retained with low development levels in these areas and important projects covering the Dark Peak, Eastern Moors and South West Peak assisting the pursuit of conservation objectives.

A landscape character led approach embedded by policy L1 has ensured close consideration of the wider scenic qualities of the National Park.
4.3 Recreation and Tourism

4.3.1 Policy Objectives
Policies for recreation and tourism set out a positive approach to encourage in accordance with the Landscape Strategy and Action to enable such development in support of the second statutory purpose of national parks.

Policy RT1 supports proposals for recreation, environmental education and interpretation, including facilities and businesses which encourage understanding and enjoyment of the National Park, appropriate to and not in conflict with its valued characteristics and which encourage opportunities for access for sustainable means.

Attractions or facilities such as theme parks and larger holiday parks with swimming pools, restaurants, cinemas and sports equipment that are unrelated to the National Park will be strictly resisted in favour of facilities that both conserve and the National Park and encourage the enjoyment and understanding of it.

RT2 and RT3 provide scope for tourism accommodation with particular emphasis on bed and breakfast and self-catered holiday cottages, along with small-scale caravan and camping sites, all of which provide locations and experiences of the park landscapes and its villages to support enjoyment and encourage spend close to service centres, or as a diversified income to the farming community.

4.3.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy RT1</th>
<th>Recreation, environmental education and interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Number of applications granted and completions for development to promote recreation / Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
The policy supports the provision of recreation, environmental education and interpretation developments which encourage the sustainable enjoyment of the National Park. To reflect its special status, developments should be appropriate to the valued characteristics. For example, proposals which do not reflect, explore or depend on characteristics such as the natural beauty, wildlife, historic buildings, customs or quiet enjoyment will not be acceptable. Factors such as landscape impact, environmental capacity, scale and intensity of use or activity will be important considerations. Some parts of the National Park are particularly valued for the wilderness and solitude they offer, which must be maintained.

**Indicator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permissions for to promote recreation / Understanding</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no numeric target is applied to this indicator the level of permissions each year suggests this indicator is on trend. It is difficult to understand the Indicator without monitoring completions and currently there is no resource to collect completions data for recreation / understanding developments.
### Policy RT3

#### Caravans and camping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Caravan &amp; Camping site Permissions and Completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0 new static caravans, chalets or lodges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**

Camping and caravanning is the most popular type of holiday accommodation in the Peak District. The following policy will enable a range of sizes and types of site to cater for holidaymakers, provided there is no adverse impact on landscapes and valued characteristics. Policies will particularly encourage well located sites where there are currently gaps in provision.

**Indicator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissions for static caravans, chalet or lodges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3.3 Statement of Progress

Policies aim to support the pursuit of National Park purposes. Good progress has been made in permitting facilities and information which support and encourage a high quality visitor experience. A small research project will investigate further the nature of these developments. Early in 2015/16 a small scheme for 2 camping pods have been permitted on the National Park camp site at North Lees. Such developments are an exception under policy RT3 where they realise only minimal impact to the landscape.
4.4 Climate Change and Sustainable Building

4.4.1 Policy Objectives
Policy CC1 states that the highest possible standards of carbon reductions are required and in new housing nationally recognised standards must be applied. The energy hierarchy is strongly promoted to ensure that the best possible advantage is sought from within the fabric of a building before we alter the external character.

Policy CC2 ensures that a wide range of renewable energy solutions are encouraged through policy where they integrate well and do not harm the character of the landscape. A Supplementary Planning Document was adopted in 2013 to specifically support this aim.

Policies CC3 and 4 support sustainable means of managing waste in the National Park that deal with the issue at a local scale, e.g. for domestic and farm based waste. Policies do not support the importation of waste from outside a community, to ensure that strategic streams of waste intended for treatment at approved County Council sites outside the National Park are not diverted to small communities within the protected area with clear issues for landscape, traffic and other environmental impact with knock on consequences for the enjoyment of the National Park by the public.

Policy CC5 provides a sustainable basis for managing flood risk and water conservation as part of development proposals by steering development away from flood risk areas, the encourage of sustainable drainage schemes and making connections between flood management schemes and wider environmental benefit such as habitat creation or landscape enhancement.

4.4.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy CC1</th>
<th>Climate Change mitigation and adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Proportion of new residential development meeting the standard required by government for affordable housing provided by Registered Social Landlords in the Code for Sustainable Homes / &amp; Other Environmental Management Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
All development, including replacement and enhancement schemes will need to demonstrate how it has had regard to the energy hierarchy. In addition, all housing, other than privately built affordable housing development of one and two units, will be required to achieve higher sustainability standards as a means of adapting to and mitigating climate change.

Indicator:
Between 2013-15 all new residential development provided by Registered Social Landlords and by replacement dwellings have met the code for sustainable homes. Other developments have been encouraged to increase the sustainability credentials of the scheme.
### Policy CC2: Low Carbon and renewable energy development

**Indicator:** Standalone Applications granted and completed for other low carbon developments and for renewable energy generation

**Target:** No numeric target applied

**Policy:**
The purpose of this policy is to reduce carbon emissions. The 2010 National Parks Circular requires a renewed focus on achieving National Park purposes and leading the way in adapting to, and mitigating climate change as a key outcome of the next five years.

**Indicator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permissions for low carbon developments and for renewable applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy CC2: Low Carbon and renewable energy development

**Indicator:** Objections on consultations and district authority responses

**Target:** None

**Policy:**
The National Park Authority's policies for landscape and conservation are set out in policy L1. Development must conserve and enhance landscape character, natural beauty, wildlife, cultural heritage and valued characteristics in accordance with the statutory purposes under the Environment Act 1995. The valued characteristics include the flow of landscape character across and beyond the National Park boundary; which provides a continuity of landscape and valued setting for the National Park. This is a special value attached to the National Park by surrounding urban communities.

**Indicator:** There were 2 applications

### Policy CC3: Waste management - domestic, industrial and commercial waste

**Indicator:** Applications for waste management

**Target:** None

**Policy:**
The purpose of this policy is to achieve more sustainable use of resources. There can be an inter-relationship between energy production and waste development, with waste being used as a source of energy production. In any proposal for energy from waste development the Authority will consider the proposal against all relevant policies including CC2 on low carbon and renewable energy development; however policies CC3 or CC4 will be primary considerations.

**Indicator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permissions for waste management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 0 applications for waste management sites in the Peak District National Park during this time.
Policy CC4: Waste management - on-farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure and slurry

Indicator: Number of small-scale community waste management facilities granted (excluding on-farm manure and slurry development (see CC4))

Target: None

Policy:
Agricultural waste is a particular issue given the rural nature of the National Park and the fact that it is a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ). Policies seek to protect the environment and help farmers to manage agricultural waste. Small-scale waste management facilities on farms may be permitted provided that waste arises from the farm or farms concerned, and provided that any development can be accommodated without harm to the valued characteristics or other established uses of the area.

Indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count and type of waste management facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 0 applications for Count and type of waste management facilities in the Peak District National Park during this time.

Policy CC4: Waste management - on-farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure and slurry

Indicator: Number of new on-farm anaerobic digestion waste management facilities permitted

Target: None

Policy:
Anaerobic digestion can protect the environment by processing animal faeces, urine, manure, slurry and spoiled straw into digestate for spreading on the land. Single on-farm units are more likely to be acceptable in terms of scale in the designated landscape. However, policy CC4 recognises that farms in close proximity may wish to group together to achieve functional and economic viability and ensure that there is sufficient feedstock for the digestion process. This will be permitted provided that a comparative analysis of single on-farm proposals shows that a shared facility is beneficial. The National Park Authority would expect to see individual waste management plans or NVZ records. Anaerobic digestate produced from waste material from individual farms or from groups of farms, where environmental impact is satisfactorily addressed, can also generate biogas for use as a fuel.

Indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count and type of waste on farm anaerobic digestion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 0 applications for on-farm anaerobic digestion waste management facilities in the Peak District National Park during this time.

Policy CC5: Permissions for new build in flood zone

Indicator: Permissions for new build in flood zone

Target: No development in mapped zone flood risk areas

Policy:
This policy seeks to safeguard floodplains, secure a net reduction in overall flood risk, encourage Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), and reduce water consumption. The policy mirrors the expectations of PPS25 on
Development and Flood Risk. It reflects the strategic need to understand flood risk, and to reduce those risks. It recognises the need to avoid flood risk areas and protect functional flood plains (and water storage/conveyancing corridors). It recognises that where options to limit or avoid flood risk are few, there is a need to reduce the risk, especially for the most vulnerable types of development such as sheltered housing, schools, and sources of potential contamination. In some cases, because of the lack of appropriate ‘safe’ options, development in areas of risk may be allowed, but only where adequate levels of mitigation and flood protection can be secured. Where practicable, areas of flood plain may be re-established where they have been previously developed or protected by flood defenses.

Indicator:

Number and Application type of permissions granted within the flood zone (2013/14-2014/15):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement Consent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Minerals Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Planning Application (EIA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Planning Applications (Major Applications and 13 week deadlines)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Planning Permission</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDO Application extended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building Consent (alter or extend)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Application</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between the financial years 2013 – 2015 there were 151 applications granted on the flood zone. Of these, only 20 made a significant impact the footprint of a building or developed an impermeable structure over the ground. The majority of these developments were extensions to dwellings or erection of agricultural buildings. The largest development (NP/DDD/0311/0150) for 3 local needs houses. The Environment Agency were consulted and no objection was listed (http://hub/index.cfm/document/view/documentid/24625703).

There were 2 applications which enhanced the flood protection in the enhancement.

| Application Number | Application Type | Development Description | |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| NP/DDD/1014/1086   | Full Planning Permission | Creation of swale along Agricultural Way, Bakewell to alleviate flooding problems. | |
| NP/DDD/0714/0752   | Full Planning Permission | River bank reinforcement and stabilisation, installation of safety barriers and resurfacing of sections of track | |

There has been development in the flood zone.

4.4.3 Statement of Progress

The Authority’s Climate Change SPD has been redesigned and promoted with case studies, videos and business cards produced pointing to the guidance and good practice. In addition 2 farm advisors are working closely with a range of farms to promote and encourage the use of energy efficient practices and renewable energy to help cut costs and carbon emissions. Free planning advice is being given to ensure good quality schemes that fit well with local landscape and heritage considerations.

Good numbers of approvals are demonstrated by the data, i.e. 24 instances of stand-alone renewables and low carbon development supported. The Authority has refused a series of wind turbine applications predominantly in the more open landscapes of the White Peak plateau but used policy to encourage alternatives that integrate more effectively, such as solar arrays on farm shed roofs and ground arrays.
Through the Authority’s corporate performance monitoring there has been an additional push to ensure the Authority takes a proactive stance re sustainability. The following data has been taken as a snapshot of two months to analyse the impact of policy through the decision making process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 2015</th>
<th>May 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of planning applications</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of planning applications that could incorporate energy efficiency and micro renewables</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage incorporating energy efficiency and micro renewables at application stage</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of approved permissions incorporating energy efficiency and micro renewables at decision stage</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further work will be done to assess the credibility of this data but indications are that in both sample months planning officers have been able to utilise policy to encourage a greater proportion of developments to incorporate sustainability measures.

During the monitoring period many changes to national policy have been brought forward with the general aim of reducing the perceived burden on developers. As such many planning gains, e.g. the requirements for affordable homes and increased sustainability standards have been removed.

In future Authorities will no longer be able to require development to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes and as such the ability to negotiate will be even more important.

During 2015/16 the Authority has received its first application for an Anaerobic Digester at a farm in the White Peak. Progress on this application will be recorded in the next AMR.
4.5 Homes, shops and community facilities

4.5.1 Policy Objectives
There remains no target to provide open market housing in the National Park, leaving three main ways to justify new homes via policy HC1. Firstly where they address the local need for affordable housing, secondly where they provide for key workers in agriculture and other rural enterprises (policy HC2 also applies), and thirdly where they are justified to achieve the conservation or enhancement of a building of character or a settlement listed in the plan.

In the last of these approaches contributions are also sought for the provision of affordable housing where it does not undermine the conservation objectives.

Policy HC3 provides limited provision for gypsy and traveller sites where there are exceptional circumstances of proven need for a small site that can be met without compromising national park purposes.

Policies HC4 and 5 support the provision of new community facilities and to protect existing ones, as well as looking at the important role shops play in Bakewell and the villages as well as supporting small scale trade on farms and other countryside businesses where they are ancillary to other businesses to relate directly to recreation and tourism in the area and take account of the impact on local centres.

4.5.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy HC1 and HC2</th>
<th>New Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Permissions and completions by type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
New housing in the National Park is not required to meet open market demand. The limited number of opportunities for new residential development emphasises the importance of concentrating on the need within the National Park for affordable (including intermediate) homes, rather than catering for a wider catchment area.

**Indicator:**
Between 1991-2015 there were on average, 17 new build Open Market new build and 16 Local Needs new build completions per annum. There are large fluctuations in the housing stock completions levels with no trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gross 2013/14</th>
<th>Net 2013/14</th>
<th>Gross 2014/15</th>
<th>Net 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture or Holiday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary or Holiday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 1991-2015 there were on average, 21 Holiday and 81 Residential (not including Holiday) Local Needs Net completions per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>2013/14 Gross</th>
<th>2013/14 Net</th>
<th>2014/15 Gross</th>
<th>2014/15 Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var. of Cond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>2013/14 Gross</th>
<th>2013/14 Net</th>
<th>2014/15 Gross</th>
<th>2014/15 Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var. of Cond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>2013/14 Gross</th>
<th>2013/14 Net</th>
<th>2014/15 Gross</th>
<th>2014/15 Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var. of Cond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>2013/14 Gross</th>
<th>2013/14 Net</th>
<th>2014/15 Gross</th>
<th>2014/15 Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var. of Cond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion on indicator

A gap in data still exists regarding the number of permissions. This requires a change to the M3 planning database.
Policy HC3  |  Permission for Gypsy and traveller pitches
---|---
Indicator | Permissions for Gypsy and traveller pitches
Target | No numeric target applied

Policy:
National policy requires planning authorities to address the accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. The Derbyshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2008 did not identify any need for pitches in the National Park. Nevertheless, this Core Strategy retains the approach introduced in the Local Plan, where exceptional circumstances might justify temporary accommodation for gypsies and travellers, adapting it to encompass travelling showpeople.

Indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 0 applications for Gypsy and traveller pitches during this time

Policy HC4  |  Provision and retention of community services and facilities
---|---
Indicator | Applications granted/completed from community facilities or shops by type of provision and by type of development (new build, conversion, change of use)
Target | No numeric target applied

Policy:
There has been a decline in community services over the last ten years, particularly of shops, post offices, healthcare facilities and public houses. The Authority will continue to strongly resist the loss of any facility or service which meets an essential community need that is not available or reasonably accessible elsewhere. In all cases, another beneficial community use should be sought before permission is granted for removal of these facilities. Clear evidence of non-viability will be required, such as marketing the building or facility for a period of time to test whether another community interest, operator or owner could be found.

Indicator:

2013/14:
There were 6 incidents of losses of community facilities (0.8% of all planning permissions issued in 2013/14). These were split into:

| Changing from A4 (pub) use to C class | 1 |
| Changing from D1 (church/Sunday school) to C class | 3 |
| Changing from B1 (bakery/offices) to C class | 2 |

Of these 6 losses to C class use, 5 of them were converted into private dwellings (C3), one of these was to be an affordable home and one was converted into a hotel (C1).

There were 7 incidents of gains to community facilities. These were split into:

| From ‘Class C’ to offices (B1) *(one of these was from C2 residential, two of them were from C3 private dwelling) | 3 |
| Extend dwelling (C3) to provide commercial dining (A3) | 1 |
| Erection of a new tea room (A3) | 1 |
| From agricultural to farm shop (A1) | 1 |
| From agricultural to education (D1) | 1 |
2014/15:

There were 17 incidents of **losses** of community facilities (2.2% of all planning permissions issued in 2014/2015). These were split into:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change from A3 to C class</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing from youth club to C class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from A1 (retail, 2 x post offices, piano salesroom) to C class</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from D1 (Sunday School, education centre) to C class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from B1 (offices, retail storage) to C class</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from B2 (Mill) to C class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from A2 (bank) to C class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these 17 losses to C class use, all of them were converted into private dwellings (C3), one of the units was to be an affordable home.

8 of the 17 losses (47%) were in Bakewell, which lost 3 retail units, 1 retail storage area and 4 office areas.

There were 9 incidents of **gains** to community facilities. These were split into:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From (C3) to offices (B1)</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil to (B1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B (C1) to café (C3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural to (B) use</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterworks to (B1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy HCS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shops, professional services and related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**

The following policy supports retail premises and related activities within named settlements in Policy DS1. This includes all other uses within Use Classes A1-5, such as financial services, restaurants and cafes, pubs and hot food takeaways. In Bakewell, the Central Shopping Area will be retained, to continue to consolidate shopping facilities in the town centre. The only exception to the focus on towns and villages is to allow small scale retail provision which is ancillary to a business or relates directly to a recreation or tourism activity, where this is appropriate to the sensitivity of its countryside location. Elsewhere, retail development will not be permitted.

*Use Class (A): A1 Shops, A2 Financial and Professional Services, A3 Restaurants and Cafes, A4 Drinking Establishments & A5 Hot Food Takeaways*

**Indicator:**

There were 33 applications between 2013-2015 for use class A. However, there were no permissions for a new build development.

**4.5.3 Statement of Progress**

The monitoring period again demonstrates the fluctuations that occur in housing development. The graph below demonstrates this over a longer time period and also highlights the longer aim of reducing the pressures from open market housing development from the pre-structure plan era to a position today where there is a more acceptable balance of locally needed housing delivery alongside open market development where this helps to enable heritage led planning that supports National Park purposes.
The above graph shows a linear trend for Open Market and Local Need housing. The data shows weak $r^2$ regression due to the noisy data. Therefore, the trend of decreasing Open Market and increasing Local Need housing is not statistically robust. Due to the low number of completions and large external factors such as the economy, completions data in the National Park will never show correlation. However, over the past 25 years the cumulative levels of average completions do appear to be decreasing for Open Market and remaining level for Local Need.

Early in 2015/16 2 further village developments have been completed in Youlgrave and Birchover offering a range of locally needed affordable housing and open market housing where this has driven the enhancement of a former quarry site. Figures will be reported in the next AMR.

This section also highlights the pressures that arise in retaining community services and the desire of applicants to change such premises into housing. Members have sought tougher tests in Development Management policies to ensure adequate market testing of these important services to ensure that they are only lost after proof is demonstrated that they are no longer needed or viable.
4.6 Supporting Economic development

4.6.1 Policy Objectives
Economic policies E1 and E2 offer scope for new build business premises in Bakewell and villages listed in the plan and offer great scope for the reuse of buildings for business use, including more modern buildings as part of negotiations which seek either greatly enhanced building design or demolition and replacement with a better located and designed building. Existing business land and buildings will be protected unless it is considered that they can be put to more beneficial community use, e.g. for affordable housing or community facilities. Emerging development management policies will consider the need to specifically safeguard those sites (i.e. by identifying these on a proposals map), particularly in Bakewell and the Hope Valley which demonstrate the highest quality and most sustainable locations.

Policy E2 provides particular support for business opportunities in the countryside by making effective use of existing buildings in smaller hamlets and on farms and by ensuring that the links between land management businesses and new business are maintained to enable additional income to support traditional land-based industries. Business growth will be judged carefully in terms of its impact on the appearance and character of the landscapes in which they sit.

4.6.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Business Development in Towns and Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Business permissions inside, on the edge and outside of named settlements (loss of business through refusal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
Policy will allow small businesses to set up within or on the edge of named settlements listed in policy DS1, at a level appropriate for the needs of people living in the immediate local area. Town or village locations are more likely to be served by public transport and allow workers easy access to services and facilities.

**Indicator:**
Data not fully available (currently no system in place to monitor).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Business Development in Towns and Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Number of refusals inside named settlements for loss of business use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
The National Park Authority wishes to keep the best business sites and buildings from other development pressures. It will also be important to retain some lower quality sites to offer a range of opportunities for business start-up and growth. The Employment Land Review will be used, together with the consideration of other factors, to assess needs and opportunities and identify the best existing sites to meet the needs of people living in the local area.
**Policy E1**  
**Business Development in Towns and Villages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Applications granted using section 73 to lift business use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
The National Park Authority wishes to keep the best business sites and buildings from other development pressures. It will also be important to retain some lower quality sites to offer a range of opportunities for business start-up and growth. The Employment Land Review will be used, together with the consideration of other factors, to assess needs and opportunities and identify the best existing sites to meet the needs of people living in the local area. Section 73 applications are sometimes used as a means of changing the nature of a development via the conditions.

**Indicator:**
For 2013/14 there were 10 Section 73 applications granted. None of these removed business use.

For 2014/15 there were 16 Section 73 applications granted. One of these removed business use (ie NP/DDD/0614/0596 – Rutland Works, Coombs Road, Bakewell).

**Policy E2**  
**Business in the Countryside**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Permissions for business use outside of named settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>No numeric target applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
Government policy recognises the role of agriculture in maintaining and managing the countryside and valued landscapes. Policy E2 seeks to broaden the opportunity for rural business, and offers scope for business enterprise by making positive use of traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit or modern buildings in some circumstances. Alongside policy E1 this policy gives spatial guidance to direct business development to the best locations and conserve the more sensitive areas. This policy applies to all areas of the National Park outside the Natural Zone and named settlements (see policy DS1). The intention of this policy is to encourage small scale business development within any smaller settlement, on farmsteads, and in groups of buildings in sustainable locations. It will foster rural enterprise and allow farmers and land managers to diversify their income, helping them to maintain their land and buildings sustainably and conform to core policies to protect the valued characteristics of the area.

**Indicator:**
Between 2013-2015 there were 45 permission relating to B use class (B1 business). Of these, 6 were new build developments 4 of which were inside named settlements. 2 developments were outside a named settlement which was a replacement warehouse & undercover storage area building with a small increase in floorspace from the previous building.

Given this, the indicator is on track as there has been no further new build Business (Use Class B) development outside of named settlements.

### 4.6.3 Statement of Progress

Despite some gaps in data it is clear that policies have facilitated a high number of businesses overall during the monitoring period. Moreover there is evidence that only a very low number of applications have been used to alter planning conditions through section 73 applications to remove business use. Spatially the highest proportion of new
build development has been focussed into towns and villages, with other development occurring through change of use and conversion.

Instances of large scale growth and intensification are noted through cases taken to planning committee and reported in this AMR. These highlight issues of non-conforming uses and the need to take care with impact on landscape character. Also observed is the changing nature of farming practices into diversified uses and the need to retain a link between new incomes and land management.
4.7 Minerals

4.7.1 Policy Objectives

Minerals development is strongly controlled so that only exceptional cases may be permitted (MIN1) where this provides for fluorspar by underground means (MIN2), or for local small-scale building and roofing stone supplies (MIN3). MIN4 also provides a basis for the safeguarding of the mineral resource, including the mineralised vein structures (fluorspar), very high purity limestone and other limestone.

4.7.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy MIN1</th>
<th>Minerals Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>After care of Mineral site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:

The restoration of mineral workings is a significant opportunity to achieve National Park Authority outcomes for achieving amenity (nature conservation) after-use for the sites, enhancing landscape and biodiversity and providing recreational opportunities, as well as the objectives of landowners, mineral companies and local people. The National Park Management Plan observes that restored sites may provide opportunities for increased biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural interest.

Indicator:

See statement of progress section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy MIN2</th>
<th>Fluorspar proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>No permissions for proposals of opencast mining of fluorspar one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:

Opencast mining of fluorspar ore will in future be resisted unless the exceptional circumstances tests set out in MPS1 can be demonstrated (see footnote to policy MIN1 for the detail of the exceptional circumstances criteria*). Based upon the understanding of where surface resources are located it is considered to be unlikely that proposals in those locations will be able to comply with all the exceptional circumstances, due firstly to the availability of the option of underground mining which could be expected to have less environmental impact, and secondly to the considerable foreseeable difficulty of working likely sites in an environmentally acceptable manner.

Indicator:

No planning permissions were granted for the open mining of fluorspar ore during 2013/14 or 2014/15.
4.7.3 Statement of Progress

2013/14

Mineral working continues to be one of the most contentious areas of development within the National Park.

A planning application for the winning and working of gritstone at Burntwood Quarry for building and walling stone at Chatsworth House and Estate was received in the financial year (2013-14). In addition, a planning application was received to extend the period of time in which to continue the underground winning and working of fluorspar and associated mineralisation at Milldam Mine for a further 15 year period, on the grounds that no working had taken place at the site between 2000 and 2013 under the previous planning permission issued in 1999.

The applications received in the previous financial year dealing with (i) consolidation and extension of the working area at Birchover Quarry, as an alternative to progressing the stalled review of the old mineral permissions (ROMP) and; (ii) the extension at New Pilhough Quarry, in exchange for relinquishing the rights to work mineral at Stanton Moor Quarry, were still being progressed. A number of other applications were received in connection with mineral sites dealing with other variation of conditions, ancillary mineral development matters and the discharge of conditions.

Planning permissions for the winning and working of mineral at Burntwood Quarry, and for an extension of time in which to complete working and the restoration at Once a Week Quarry, were granted during the financial year.

An appeal was lodged in 2012 against the refusal to grant planning permission for an extension to the working area at New Pilhough Quarry, but the appeal was held in abeyance pending the outcome of whether the Authority would pursue a prohibition order for the old mineral planning permission issued in 1952, at Stanton Moor Quarry. The pursuit of a prohibition order was in connection with the ‘stalled’ review of the old mineral permission (ROMP) at Stanton Moor Quarry, which had been in suspension for more than 2 years. The Authority decided not to pursue a prohibition order at Stanton Moor Quarry, on the basis that there appeared to be an intention to work the site. Consequently, additional information was sought to potentially enable the stalled ROMP to be determined, and the appeal of the previously refused New Pilhough Quarry application remained in abeyance for the duration of the financial year.

In December 2013/January 2014 the Authority issued a prohibition order against the Longstone Edge East mineral planning permission issued in 1952 that allowed for the winning and working of fluorspar and barytes and the working of lead and any other minerals won in the course of working. No mineral working had taken place at the site since 2009, following the outcome of the Court of Appeal decision linked with an enforcement notice issued by the Authority in connection with the unauthorised winning and working of limestone at the site beyond that permitted, and no information had been provided by the applicant to progress the stalled ROMP. An appeal was subsequently lodged against the prohibition order by the agent acting on behalf of the applicant in January 2014.

British Fluorspar Ltd, who had taken over the interests of the former fluorspar extraction and processing company Glebe Mines Ltd who had closed in 2010, recommenced working at Milldam Mine in 2013, and implemented the working of fluorspar at Tearsall Quarry in 2013, under the mineral permission issued in 2010.

Of the 9 identified stalled ROMP’s, work is continuing to take place to either determine them conventionally in line with the ROMP legislation, deal with an alternative mineral development proposal, issue a prohibition order or seeking their resolution via the Secretary of State. In addition to the sites already mentioned above, the Shire Hill ROMP is still being progressed and an alternative development proposal is expected to be received for Topley Pike Quarry in 2014.
The periodic review of the Long Rake mineral permission was not received by November 2013. Consequently, the mineral permission ceases to exist apart from dealing with the restoration and aftercare requirements set out in the conditions attached to the initially reviewed permission.

Restoration works remained ongoing and outstanding at 11 sites, including the Shining Bank Quarry site, which went into the restoration work period in December 2013. The restoration scheme for Shining Bank includes the creation and maintenance of habitat for White Clawed Crayfish, which are a priority BAP species, for an extended duration aftercare period of an additional 10 years secured through a S106 Agreement with the landowner. The 5 year aftercare period of land management was concluded at one site, with 4 other sites remaining in the aftercare phase. This included the Goddards Quarry site, which moved into the aftercare phase in October 2012, after the restoration works, which included wildlife and landscape enhancement works, were concluded.

2014/15

Three planning applications for the winning and working of gritstone at Bretton Edge Quarry for building, walling and roofing purposes, the winning and working of limestone at Topley Pike Quarry for aggregate and non-aggregate purposes and the winning and working of limestone at Once a Week Quarry for building and walling purposes, were received in the financial year (2014-15). The planning applications at Bretton Edge Quarry and Once a Week Quarry sought a working area extension to the existing quarry. The Topley Pike application covered a consolidation/extension proposal as an alternative to dealing with the stalled review of the old mineral permission (ROMP) that was issued in 1966, and the periodic review of the 1947 permission.

The applications received in an earlier financial year dealing with (i) the consolidation and extension to the working area at Birchover Quarry, as an alternative to progress the stalled ROMP, and (ii) the extension at New Pilhough Quarry, in exchange for relinquishing the rights to work mineral at Stanton Moor Quarry; were still being progressed. A number of other applications were received in connection with mineral sites dealing with the variation of conditions, ancillary mineral development matters and discharge of conditions. These included, relocating a building and erecting a building to contain two wire saws at Dale View Quarry, and seeking a 12 month extension of time to finalise the deposit of quarry waste at Blakedon Hollow tailings dam.

A planning permission for a 15 year extension of time in which to continue the winning and working of mineral at Milldam Mine was granted during the financial year. In addition, the Authority granted permission to relocate an ancillary building at Dale View Quarry but refused to grant permission for a building containing the two wire saws at Dale View Quarry. The Authority also resolved to approve the application varying a number of conditions at Dale View Quarry subject to the signing of a S106 agreement, which is still to be signed. Once the S106 is signed the permission will be issued.

The appeal lodged in 2012 against the refusal to grant planning permission for an extension to the working area at New Pilhough Quarry, continues to remain in abeyance pending the receipt of additional information to progress the stalled ROMP at Stanton Moor Quarry. The Authority had earlier decided not to pursue a prohibition order at Stanton Moor Quarry on the basis that at the time there appeared to be an intention to work the site.

In December 2013/January 2014 the Authority issued a prohibition order against the Longstone Edge East planning permission that was issued in 1952, that allowed for the winning and working of fluorspar and barytes and the working of lead and any other minerals won in the course of working. No mineral working had taken place at the site since 2009, following the outcome of the Court of Appeal decision linked with an enforcement notice issued by the Authority in connection with the unauthorised winning and working of limestone at the site beyond that permitted, and no information had been provided by the applicant to progress the stalled ROMP. An appeal was subsequently
lodged against the prohibition order in January 2014. The appeal remained in abeyance pending the outcome of an Oxfordshire prohibition order appeal case.

In November 2014 the Authority issued a prohibition order against the Bakestonedale mineral permission issued in 1954, for the underground working of clay. The 1954 permission had been dormant since 1996. An appeal was lodged against the prohibition order and an inquiry has been arranged for October 2015 to consider the appeal.

Of the 9 identified stalled ROMP’s, work is continuing to take place to either deal with them conventionally under the ROMP legislation, deal with an alternative development proposal, issue a prohibition order or seek their resolution via the Secretary of State. In addition to the sites already mentioned above, the Shire Hill ROMP submission was considered by the Authority in October 2014 and issued in November 2014, and the Topley Pike consolidation application was received in August 2014 for consideration as an alternative to dealing with the ROMP.

In May 2014 the owners/operators of Wattscliffe Quarry were notified of periodic review requirement of the mineral permission. The operator requested a postponement of the periodic review for a period of 10 years which was agreed by the Authority in August 2014.

Restoration works remained ongoing and outstanding at 11 sites. The 5 year aftercare period of land management commenced at Hartshead Quarry in November 2014, after the ownership of the site was acquired by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust. The quarry had not been worked for a number of years and natural recolonization had occurred over a large area of the site. Further restoration works had been undertaken and finalised, including wildlife and landscape enhancement. 4 other sites remain in the 5 year aftercare phase.
4.8 Accessibility, travel and traffic

4.8.1 Policy Objectives

Transport policies (T1 to T7) promote more sustainable transport choices while balancing the reality of car use in a rural area. This means a shift away from road building including removal of support for relief roads in Bakewell and Tintwistle with associated policies which resist the growth in cross-park traffic. Allied to this is support for sustainable transport by means of rail, bus, horse riding and pedestrian access. The design of traffic infrastructure such as signs, lighting, barriers are also raised as key matters requiring sensitivity.

4.8.2 Policy Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy T1</th>
<th>Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Average annual daily traffic flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Thresholds to be set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
The policy aims to deter traffic beyond that which is necessary for the needs of local residents, businesses and visitors. Traffic can harm the valued characteristics of the National Park through noise and gaseous emissions, disturbance and visual intrusion such as car parks. Cross-park traffic will be deterred, modal shift towards sustainable travel will be encouraged, and the impacts of traffic within environmentally sensitive locations will be minimised. There should also be good connectivity with and between sustainable modes of transport to support rural communities and their economy.

Indicator:

2013

*Average annual daily traffic flows*

- Cross-Park Roads  8,284
- A Roads  6,194
- Recreational Roads  3,319
*Overall Combined Average  5,953*

This total is 0.32% lower than the Overall Combined Average for 2012 (5,972)

This decrease in flows should be set against fairly static figures between 2010 and 2013, where the variance between 2010 and 2013 is +2.4%, with the 2012 figure being the highest over this period. Steady 2% growth over this time period would have resulted in average flows for 2014 of 6,047 vehicles.

2014

- Cross-Park Roads  9,103
- A Roads  6,541
This total is 3.1% higher than the Overall Combined Average for 2013 and 2.8% higher than the Overall Combined Average for 2012.

This increase should be set against fairly static figures between 2010 and 2013 where the variance between 2010 and 2013 is +2.4%. However, the increase for 2014 produces an overall variance between 2010 and 2014 of 5.6%. Steady 2% growth over this time period would have resulted in average flows for 2014 of 6,167 vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy T2</th>
<th>Reducing and directing traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Road building schemes number and type of scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
For road traffic, addressing known and induced demand through road building within the National Park would be difficult to achieve without harm to its valued characteristics. Consequently, government policies seek to route long distance road traffic around the National Park. Nationally, it also aims to reduce the need to travel and to manage traffic growth, including road freight. Additional road capacity will only be accepted as a last resort. Therefore other than in exceptional circumstances, the National Park Authority will oppose transport developments that increase the amount of cross-Park road traffic. Exceptional circumstances, as defined in policy GSP1, may justify a new road scheme but only after the most rigorous examination. The Authority considers that any exceptional circumstances would need to offer a clear net environmental benefit for the National Park and be in the public interest. It follows that transport developments outside the National Park will usually be opposed if they increase traffic on roads inside the National Park or have other adverse impacts on its setting and valued characteristics.

**Indicator:**
No new roads in 2013-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy T2</th>
<th>Reducing and directing traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Changes to road traffic network; number/type of scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
To minimise harm by essential road traffic, a hierarchy of roads will form a basis for spatial planning and any road improvements, traffic management schemes, and measures such as advisory route signing. Traffic will be guided first to the strategic road network and only to secondary and other roads as required, continuing the approach in the former Structure Plan. Partnership working is necessary to ensure that the hierarchy reflects not only expert knowledge on highway and traffic matters but also that of the National Park Authority on the character of the roads in terms of the natural features and recreational aspects of the Park. In partnership with constituent Highway Authorities further detail will be brought forward in the Development Management Policies DPD and on the proposals map.

**Indicator:**
No specific schemes in 2013-14
(2014-15) 1 Safety scheme at junction of A619 and B6050
Policy T3  Design of transport infrastructure  
Indicator  Sympathetic design (taking account of valued characteristics) and decluttering of infrastructure  
Target  

Policy:  
A high standard of design is needed to ensure that the appearance and maintenance of transport infrastructure, including traffic management measures respects the valued characteristics of the National Park. Specifically, care must be taken to avoid or minimise the environmental impact of new transport infrastructure projects, or improvements to existing infrastructure. Transport should also aim to improve the quality of life and retain a healthy natural environment in terms of the natural and historic features and recreational aspects.

Indicator:  
There were no specific schemes during 2013-14  
2014-15 consulted on, and able to influence mitigate a number of schemes including: -  
- A57 / Mortimer Road Weight Limit Signage Scheme  
- Tour de France Grand Depart commemorative signage  
- Meerbrook lining scheme.

Policy T4  Managing the demand for freight transport  
Indicator  Permissions granted contrary to policy (Indicator for T1 will provide an indication of freight movements)  
Target  None  

Policy:  
There is not likely to be any significant change in service freight, because the National Park population is static and there is a presumption against large developments. Setting aside the route hierarchy there are remaining issues of location and routeing of freight. The National Park is a convenient base for haulage operations, but they should be located elsewhere unless they service only National Park based industries. Similarly, developments requiring access by Large Goods Vehicles in excess of 7.5 tonnes gross laden weight, including road haulage operating centres, should not be permitted unless they are readily accessible to the Strategic or Secondary Road Network. Weight restriction orders will be sought where it is necessary to influence the routeing of Large Goods Vehicles to avoid negative environmental impacts.

Indicator:  
Not monitored

Policy T5  Managing the demand for rail, and reuse of former railway routes  
Indicator  Changes reported in safeguarded rail routes  
Target  N/A  

Policy:  
Existing and former rail routes link the East Midlands to the North West. Evidence suggests a medium term need for improvements to the Hope Valley line and, in the long term, further improvements or re-opening of the Matlock-Buxton line. The business case for the Matlock-Buxton route alone is long term. Re-opening the Woodhead railway is also cited as a long-term option, although its benefits would be reduced cross-Pennine road congestion, rather than the solving of rail network issues. It is appropriate to safeguard land for these purposes, although national policies presume against major transport developments within national parks other than in exceptional circumstances. As with the current approach, the safeguarding of land does not imply in principle support for any rail scheme. Any proposal will be assessed on its own merits, and will need to demonstrate the ability to provide a net positive effect on the National Park environment.
**Indicator:**

2013-14:
**Hope Valley Line:** Network Rail announced proposals to enhance capacity of the Hope Valley Line through the installation of passing loops, specifically at Dore and Grindleford, subject to further appraisal.

**Monsal Trail:** Funding secured through the DfT Linking Communities fund to create a multi-user route along the former Matlock to Buxton railway between Matlock and Bakewell. The section between Bakewell and Rowsley lies within the National Park, with the line of the route safeguarded.

2014-15:
**Hope Valley Line:** The Network Rail proposals to enhance capacity of the Hope Valley Line through the installation of passing loops, was delayed due to the unsuitability of the Grindleford proposal. Hathersage to Bamford was proposed as an alternative location – further detail expected during 2015.

**Monsal Trail:** Work is ongoing on the delivery of the Pedal Peak Phase II Project, funded through the DfT Linking Communities fund to create a multi-user route along the former Matlock to Buxton railway between Matlock and Bakewell. The section between Bakewell and Rowsley lies within the National Park, with the line of the route safeguarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy T6</th>
<th>Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding and waterways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Change in length of network of permissive routes and statutory routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
In accordance with national policies for modal shift and healthier living, developments should have cycle and footpath connections to existing rights of way and to settlements where services and transport interchanges are more likely to be found. Where a development proposal affects a right of way, every effort should be made to accommodate the route, or if this is not possible, to provide an equally good alternative.

**Indicator:**

2013-14
Funding secured through the DfT Linking Communities fund to create or upgrade a number of multi-user routes to / from / within the National Park. These include: -

- **White Peak Loop** south, connecting Bakewell and Matlock
- **Staffordshire Moorlands Link** north, connecting Hurdlow and Buxton
- **Little Don Link** connecting Stoke-on-Trent to Leek and the Roaches
- **Hope Valley Link** connecting Sheffield to Stocksbridge, Langsett and the Transpennine Trail

2014-15
Delivery of the multi-user routes to / from / within the National Park, funded secured through the DfT Linking Communities is ongoing. These routes include: -

- **White Peak Loop** south, connecting Bakewell and Matlock
- **Staffordshire Moorlands Link** north, connecting Hurdlow and Buxton
- **Little Don Link** connecting Stoke-on-Trent to Leek and the Roaches
- **Hope Valley Link** connecting Hathersage and Hope

Connecting Sheffield to Stocksbridge, Langsett and the Transpennine Trail
Hope Valley Link connecting Hathersage and Hope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy T7</th>
<th>Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for coach parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Report changes to traffic management arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
Managing the demand for parking can help to mitigate the more harmful impacts of motor vehicles whilst having regard to the needs of local communities and businesses. Successive local policies have kept operational parking and parking in housing developments to a minimum, and restricted non-operational parking to discourage car use. This principle is retained and amplifies guidance on park and ride. The policy is consistent with regional parking policies, and other planning and transport measures, promoting sustainable transport choices and reducing reliance on the car for work and other journeys. In order to manage demand, coach parking spaces should not be used by cars.

And policy principle C:
Non-residential parking will be restricted in order to discourage car use, and will be managed to ensure that the location and nature of car and coach parking does not exceed environmental capacity. New non-operational parking will normally be matched by a reduction of related parking spaces elsewhere, and wherever possible it will be made available for public use.

Indicator:

2013-14
The NPA were consulted on a number of car park proposals and lining schemes during this year, including at the following locations: -

- Macclesfield Forest (including extensive yellow lining, as part of a wider traffic management scheme)
- Tissington Village (as part of a wider traffic management scheme)

2014-15
Discussions continued on a number of car park proposals and lining schemes during this year, including at the following locations: -

- Macclesfield Forest (including extensive yellow lining, as part of a wider traffic management scheme)
- Tissington Village (as part of a wider traffic management scheme)
- Goyt Valley (lining scheme)
- Litton (as part of a wider traffic management scheme).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy T7</th>
<th>Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for coach parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Number of new off-street parking spaces provided, and proportion/number that replaces on-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy:
Working in partnership, the National Park Authority intends to build on the success of the current traffic management schemes, and modify them to meet the demands of changing visitor travel patterns. This approach will inform future traffic management schemes in environmentally sensitive areas, where travel patterns, including those of visitors, have a clear negative impact on the environment, both natural and built. Care will be required to avoid displacing impact to other sensitive areas and nearby settlements, or creating visitor use beyond environmental carrying capacity even where they use sustainable transport. We will seek to ensure income generated by these schemes will be reinvested to provide maintenance, additional facilities and alternative means of access. All schemes must make the best use of the road network to improve road safety, environmental and traffic conditions, and to reduce conflicts between various user groups.
Indicator:

2013-15
Goyt Valley, there are ongoing proposals to introduce yellow lining throughout the valley and parking charges in the off-road car parks.

4.8.3 Statement of Progress

Overall, traffic levels in the National Park had broadly plateaued from 2010 to 2013, with only minor fluctuations generally attributable to the weather. However, 2014 saw a growth in flows above 2%. This may be due to an upswing in the economy or as a result of more clement weather conditions in comparison with previous years. There have been no major road or rail schemes constructed or implemented, with no consequent effect on the level and direction of traffic in the national park. Furthermore, there have been very few contentious highways infrastructure installations, as opposed to previous years. This is partly down to a reduction in highway authority budgets, and partly as a result of improved understanding and agreements between highway authorities and the National Park Authority.

Cycling infrastructure was given a boost during 2011 with the opening of the Monsal Trail, and work continues to expand and develop new and existing links. The Pedal Peak Phase II Project will result in a number of new or improved multi-user links to / from and within the National Park from 2015/16 onwards. There have been small scale changes to car park provision, along with a small number of requests for new or expanded car parks which have, or are being processed in accordance with policy.
5.0 Improvements to the Annual Monitoring Report

This AMR is the second in a series of new reports formatted under the terms of the LDF regulations. With the commitment of the new Government to free up monitoring and give greater flexibility for local choice under a general ‘duty to monitor’, this report is the start in a process to improve monitoring systems and refresh the indicators in order to reflect the policies of the LDF Core Strategy. This report has started to tackle issues with the previous AMR’s;

- Accuracy and reliability
- Completeness
- Up to date status
- Relevance
- Consistency across data sources
- Appropriate presentation
- Accessibility

The monitoring framework data review and work to improve data quality is currently ongoing. In 2014, a series of meetings were undertaken to develop new indicators to monitor the LDF. This has been completed and indicators are now in place to monitor LDF Policy. However, it is our intention to ensure that all indicators and targets are kept accurate and reflect both availability of high quality data, and a good understanding of the external contextual factors which affect our indicators. This work will therefore be an iterative process to continually review and adapt our monitoring approach, led by the demands of the data and the outcomes we record, rather than a systematic structured annual review of the whole monitoring framework.

It is important to recognise that a large amount can be learned from reviewing historical performance. A number of our indicators, such as those monitoring spatial development in a National Park, will require longer term trend data (5 to 10 years) to be of use in informing judgments on performance and decisions to review policy. Due to our protected area context short term (between year) fluctuations in spatial monitoring indicators, such as those for housing completions, bear little resemblance to actual impacts over periods of a decade or more. This is as a result of the small numbers involved on an annual basis when compared to non-protected areas.

We are continuing to move forward in making changes to the internal planning database M3, to help accuracy and speed of measurements. To enable policy monitoring within the M3, the system will need a series of technical changes in the way we record and report. This is a significant project and will involve a number of large process changes to implement. A number of indicators in this report are reliant on updating the process and technology of data capture.

Many areas of data collection will also benefit from small research projects to investigate issues further, e.g. by looking into planning files and reports to analyse the finer nature of cases and issues raised. These are raised throughout the report.

Contextual data which underpin both this monitoring framework and that for the National Park Management Plan now resides within the online State of the Park Report [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/sopr](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/sopr). This is updated on a rolling programme and is refreshed when new data become available.