

Minutes of Local Plan Review Member Steering Group 20th June 2022

10am, Hybrid meeting via Webex and at Aldern House

1. Roll Call

Officers	Members
Joanne Cooper (Planning Liaison Officer)	Chris Furness
Adele Metcalfe (Policy and Communities Team Manager)	Janet Haddock Fraser
Tim Nicholson (Transport Policy Planner)	Annabel Harling
Brian Taylor (Head of Planning)	Robert Helliwell
	Ken Smith
	Andrew McCloy

Apologies

Yvonne Witter

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 16th May 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

2. Introduction and Presentation

The aims of the session were outlined as follows:

- **To inform members about the updated timetable for Issues and Options**
- **To inform members about current planning policy for Recreation and Tourism and to highlight issues relating to the performance of policy and new challenges**
- **For members to debate these issues around a series of key questions**
- **For members to give officers a clear steer on the key questions**

The timetable for Issues and Options is set out in Appendix 1, attached to the minutes.

The Policy and Communities Team Manager advised that work on the Minerals topic had been delayed due to resource issues but an external consultant had been engaged and the work would commence shortly.

The Transport Policy Planner delivered a presentation setting out the Authority's existing policies on recreation and tourism, an assessment of how these policies have performed, and the results of the early stages of consultation. The challenges that the National Park currently face in this area were also outlined.

Members discussed issues around the increase in the use of mobile homes and camper vans. It was also suggested that Air BNB was becoming increasingly significant and should be considered in the Plan review.

Overnight parking of camper vans on the roadside, particularly at Stanage was felt to be a concern, although it was acknowledged that roadside parking was not in the jurisdiction of the Authority. Additionally moving these vans into e.g. new campsites would have an impact on the landscape.

Members also emphasised the need for Officers to be aware of the Sustainable Tourism Plan of Marketing Peak District, particularly where this might be in conflict with the landscape aims of National Park policy.

It was felt that clarity was needed as to whether the Authority is trying to encourage overnight stays and therefore increase average spend per visitor or not. The carbon implications of visitors staying outside the park and travelling in were raised. In order to make the Park more accessible to visitors from diverse backgrounds, Members felt that a variety of accommodation needed to be available.

3. Key Questions

A discussion took place around key themes and questions which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The key questions were:

- a. Should DMR1 be updated to take account of other 'glamping structures' including Yurts etc?

Is the wording in relation to camping pods and shepherd's huts too restrictive? For example camping pods are permitted in small groups, but the policy refers to single shepherd's huts. Should we allow scope for small groups of shepherd's huts in appropriate locations?

Is the scale of new pods and shepherd's huts more of an issue than numbers? If so, should this be addressed within the new policy?

Is this a separate policy area as part of the review, rather than part of a wider camping and caravanning policy?

- b. Pop-up campsites can be beneficial and are allowed under the General Permitted Development Order. However, in some locations such sites have been problematic. Should the new policy take account of pop-up sites and set out the recourse of

Article 4 directions that could be used to bring problematic sites under planning control?

- c. Policy RT2 restricts new build holiday accommodation to one new hotel in Bakewell (already permitted). Is this still the correct approach?
- d. The Recreation Hubs Supplementary Planning Document work is to be incorporated into the Local Plan as part of the review? Should this incorporate a site-based approach with named sites?

Key question a.

Should DMR1 be updated to take account of other 'glamping structures' including Yurts etc?

Is the wording in relation to camping pods and shepherd's huts too restrictive? For example camping pods are permitted in small groups, but the policy refers to single shepherd's huts. Should we allow scope for small groups of shepherd's huts in appropriate locations?

Is the scale of new pods and shepherd's huts more of an issue than numbers? If so, should this be addressed within the new policy?

Is this a separate policy area as part of the review, rather than part of a wider camping and caravanning policy?

Discussion

Members noted that Shepherd's Huts are not part of the traditional local vernacular in the National Park. It was noted that this issue (being non-traditional) was understood and acknowledged at the time of writing the DMP policy on shepherd's huts, and that the resulting policy was a compromise, as huts are less inappropriate in a farmstead setting than other structures such as pods, wigwams and yurts.

It was raised that the data on this (and other issues related to tourism and recreation) was collated before the pandemic and that there may be a need for more up to date information.

Members felt that with regards to Shepherd's Huts in particular, a lot of applications had been received recently. Whilst current policy states that only one shepherd's hut per site is acceptable, Members felt that there were circumstances where this was too restrictive and a more flexible approach would be preferred, whilst at the same time considering the landscape implications and not permitting open sites.

Member Steer

Members wanted to explore the possibility of a greater degree of flexibility, but acknowledged that any additional flexibility should not lead to unacceptable landscape impacts.

Key question b.

Pop-up campsites can be beneficial and are allowed under the General Permitted Development Order. However, in some locations such sites have been problematic. Should the new policy take account of pop-up sites and set out the recourse of Article 4 directions that could be used to bring problematic sites under planning control?

Discussion

Members noted that the Permitted Development Rights for temporary uses of land had been increased to 56 days as a measure to help the economy during the pandemic, but that this had now reverted back to 28 days.

Members had no major concerns on this issue and felt that pop up campsites met a need for affordable visitor accommodation during a cost of living crisis. Officers advised that use of Article 4 directions would be resource intensive.

Member Steer

Members did not feel that there was a need for a policy on pop-up sites.

Key Question c.

Policy RT2 restricts new build holiday accommodation to one new hotel in Bakewell (already permitted). Is this still the correct approach?

Discussion

Members discussed whether there were Brownfield sites that would be suitable for hotel development. They also discussed whether there was scope for an exceptions policy which would facilitate inward investment. There was support for conversions for hotel use if the location and access were suitable. It was felt that this was particularly appropriate for former pub buildings. However the staffing of such businesses was also a consideration, i.e. could the workforce be drawn from local communities or would staff have to be bussed in?

The Head of Planning advised that one of the considerations behind the existing policy was to encourage economic development in neighbouring towns outside the National Park.

Members felt that the Local Plan review presented an opportunity to guide and manage the demand for visitor accommodation

Member Steer

There may be scope for the development of additional new hotels but only in locations/circumstances that would also deliver conservation and enhancement, for example on brownfield land.

Key question e.

The Recreation Hubs Supplementary Planning Document work is to be incorporated into the Local Plan as part of the review. Should this incorporate a site-based approach with named sites?

Discussion

Members felt that there was a benefit to having named locations in the same way as Authority policy has named settlements. This also enables sustainable transport options to be developed. However any list should not be taken to be exhaustive, so in addition to the list a set of criteria could be developed which other potential locations could be tested against.

The Transport Policy Planner advised that some similar work to this had been done with existing sites which had been tiered on 4 levels from smaller sites to larger sites. This helps to give certainty to site owners who want to bring them forward.

The Head of Planning asked whether a spatial process should be undertaken to identify additional car parking in sustainable locations as had been done previously at sites like Surprise View. Suggestions for sites could also come from partner organisations such as water companies and other land owners.

The importance of tying any future sites in with sustainable transport was emphasised, although Officers advised that there was a limit to the amount of control the Authority has over this, e.g. Upper Derwent is no longer as well served by public transport as it was. It was felt that the feasibility of transport provision needs to be a key factor in the development of recreation hubs, and that this would also be a factor in whether sites would be considered to be suitably accessible.

Member Steer

A sites based approach should be explored.

4. Next Steps

Members will be asked to participate in a Minerals workshop, at a date to be confirmed once the consultant has written the Minerals topic paper. Members will then be asked to be involved in finalising issues and options reports for approval at Authority and statutory consultation.

5. Date of next meeting

There will be a meeting to discuss Minerals Policy, date TBC

The meeting finished at 11.50am